A RESPONSE TO MESSIANIC GOOD NEWS

by Dr. Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, Th.M., Ph.D.

November 15, 2008 – Ariel Ministries

The issue I am responding to began with a simple letter I wrote to the director, Peter Cohen, of *Messianic Good News* and it was friendly letter simply asking him to be more honest in his critiques of Dispensationalism. I have been receiving *Messianic Good News* for a number of years, but periodically noticed that whenever they do any attacking on Dispensationalism, it does not seem to be a dispensationalism that Dispensationalists would recognize. There was a tendency to use a straw man argument, claiming a view that Dispensationalists do not hold or taking a view that is held only by some Dispensationalists but not by all and making it a standard to judge all Dispensationalists. My request was simply that if he was going to criticize Dispensationalism, and he certainly has a right to do so, he should do it honestly and criticize what we do believe and not criticize what we do not believe. I offered them a copy of *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology* on the condition that they would read it. This was not to convince them to become Dispensationalists but only that they would understand what it really does teach. In place of keeping it between the two of us, they choose to write a lengthy response, by another staff member, Kevin Daly, which goes on to simply repeat the same errors they were guilty of all along. They would quote a statement I made out of context and made it mean something that in context it could not possibly have meant. They launched a three-part critique, the first of which was published in their journal, *Messianic Good News,* and the second and third segments were chosen not to be published in printed form but posted on their webpage.

At least two people came to me personally, who were both on our mailing list and theirs, told me how disturbed they were by what was written since they know that it was not my position and never was and the accusations were simply quite false. One of the two even personally wrote to them asking them to print an apology for such mishandling of my material, but that was not forthcoming. Therefore, I promised to write a detailed response to be put on our webpage and that is the reason for this article.

Let me begin by simply defining the essence of Dispensationalism that would be held by Dispensationalists across the board. The essence of Dispensationalism is a consistent literal interpretation of Scripture, unless the text and context clearly indicates otherwise. It can be summarized in the simple Golden Rule of Interpretation as formulated by Dr. David L. Cooper: "When the plain sense of Scripture makes common sense, seek no other sense; therefore, take every word at its primary, ordinary, usual, literal meaning unless the facts of the immediate context, studied in the light of related passages and axiomatic and fundamental truths, indicates clearly otherwise." With that rule is a corollary principle: "A text apart from its context is a pretext". Therefore, literal interpretation does not deny the existence of symbols, or the existence of figures of speech, which all languages have. But in all languages, including English, we take what is written to be literal unless there is something that clearly indicates otherwise.

Out of the first principle arises a second important principle: A consistent distinction between Israel and the Church. It denies the Church is "New Israel" or "Spiritual Israel" and denies that there is any passage in the New Testament where the term "Israel" is ever used of the Church. In fact, the term "Israel" appears exactly 73 times in the New Testament and not once does it refer to the Church. It will sometimes refer to all Jews in general and sometimes specifically to Jewish believers, but never to Gentile believers and never to the Church. Therefore, Dispensationalism affirms that what God promised to Israel He will keep to Israel and what He promised to the Church He will keep to the Church and the Church does not replace Israel in God's covenantal program. Therefore, whatever promises have not been fulfilled up to the present time will be fulfilled in the future. Many assume that the unique mark of Dispensationalism is the Pretribulational Rapture, but that is only a result of the second principle. Furthermore, there are many Pretribulationalists that are not Dispensationalists such as the Bible Presbyterian Church denomination that is non-dispensational but is Pretribulational. Thus Pretribulationalism is not unique to Dispensationalism as many seem to think.

Obviously, many Evangelicals debate those two principles that are held to by Dispensationalists, but they usually do not refer to these views as being heretical. As a general rule, the term "heresy" is applied to those that deny the key fundamentals of the faith, fundamentals that they do not believe or they choose to deny which also affects whether they are truly saved or not. We may disagree with some other doctrines, but those who hold to those other doctrines will not be categorized as being heretics. For example, I am a firm believer that the only kind of baptism the Bible teaches is a baptism by immersion, and it is only for those who already have believed. Obviously, other Evangelicals hold to infant baptism and also hold to either sprinkling or pouring as valid forms of baptism. I would strongly disagree with such views, but I would not refer to the people who hold these views as being heretical because they do not affect the fundamentals of the faith. One can believe in one form of baptism or the other and still be saved. Of course, there are many other examples like this we can offer.

So in essence, Dispensationalism is a theology that believes in the consistent distinction between Israel and the Church which is based upon a consistent application of literal interpretation of Scripture. Certainly accepting the Bible literally where it requires literal interpretation should not be declared a heresy. I take a literal view of the six days of creation, but those who choose to believe otherwise should hardly label those who take the Bible literally to be heretics. Yet, that is what often happens.

With this background, let me now begin to deal with the article produced by *Messianic Good News.*

The article published in the first quarter 2008 of *Messianic Good News* is entitled "Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth: The Dispensational Scheme of Bible Interpretation in Light of Scripture" by Kevin Daly.

Right in the opening paragraph Mr. Daly makes a glaring untrue statement. In it he claims that in "in a recent correspondence, Dr. Arnold Fruchtenbaum, Director of

Ariel Ministries and author of the books *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology* and *The Footsteps of the Messiah: A Study of the Sequence of Prophetic Events,* challenges the understanding that the New Testament is the fulfillment of the Old…", copies of my correspondence with them will be attached to the end of this article and the readers can judge for themselves whether I actually made such a statement in that letter. I for one certainly do believe and have believed that the New Testament records the fulfillment of many Old Testament prophecies and in fact, I have a book entitled *Messianic Christology: What the Old Testament Said about the Messiah*, where I show how one prophecy after another and after another was fulfilled by Yeshua (Jesus) of Nazareth. But I certainly deny that all prophecies have been fulfilled. I certainly affirm that all prophecy intended to be fulfilled by the First Coming, has been fulfilled, but there are still prophecies of the future that need to have a future fulfillment. This is an example how people can twist what was written and again the reader is urged to read my original letter at the end of this document. To state that the New Testament fulfilled the Old is too broad a statement. Much of the Old has been fulfilled in the New. But there is much more yet to be fulfilled. But Daly, as we shall see, wants to put it that way since he sees no future for ethnic Israel in the prophecies, and that whatever those prophecies plainly say was not God's original intent!

Daly claims that I affirm that "the Bible should rather be interpreted according to the following principles..." Here again, I would encourage the reader to look at the original letter I wrote to see what I actually said and not the way that they have chosen to twist what I have said. The first principle they claim that I said is "The New Testament may not be read as interpretation of the Old Testament;". As the reader can see from the letter I wrote, it was not quite the way that I put it. What I said was that the New Testament cannot be used to interpret the Old, not that the New Testament "may not be read as an interpretation of the Old Testament". My point in context was the New Testament cannot be used to interpret the Old Testament in a way that what the Old Testament actually said in its plain original meaning is now totally changed to mean something else. In other words, if God made a specific promise to Israel, like the promise of the Land, can the New Testament be used to reinterpret the Old Testament to make it mean something other than literal land given to a literal people? Those who hold such a view as Professor George Eldan Ladd at Fuller Theological Seminary wrote, the New Testament "reinterprets" the Old Testament. At least this author admitted that what the Old Testament said was one thing but the New Testament reinterprets what the Old Testament said, which in turn means that what the Old Testament said is not going to come to pass, but must be spiritualized in accordance with the New Testament's reinterpretation. That is exactly what I deny as valid. Whatever else the New Testament may wish to add to the prophetic program of God, it cannot simply reinterpret, rewrite, and change what the Old Testament said. What they are really trying to do in reality is not to interpret the Old by the New, but to *re*interpret the Old by the New and therefore, what the Old Testament said cannot be true or valid. That is the exact point of my denial. Again, I affirm that what God promised to Israel He will keep to Israel and one cannot use the New Testament to interpret the Old in such a way that God will no longer fulfill His promises to Israel. But that is exactly what Daly believes must happen.

The second principle they claim I hold is "the Old Testament must be understood in its original context, unaffected by the teachings of Christ and the New Testament…". Again, the reader is encouraged to look at the end where my letter is actually printed to see if I actually made such a statement. The books of the Old Testament were written between 1400 BC and 400 BC and so it took about 1,000 years for the Old Testament to be written. The New Testament would appear four to five centuries later after the last prophet of the Old Testament had spoken. Did the Old Testament saints have to wait until the New Testament was written to know what the Old Testament actually taught? Isaiah wrote His book in the seventh century B.C. and he clearly spelled out many prophecies of the First and Second Coming and talked about a future for Jerusalem, a future restoration of the Jewish people, and all of the Promised Land, among many other prophecies he gave. Did the believers of Isaiah's day have to simply keep the book closed and wait until the New Testament came around to finally understand what Isaiah "really" meant? On what basis should the Jews of the first century have recognized Jesus to be the Messiah? Isaiah's prophecy should have been one of those criteria. Furthermore, the prophecies about the Messiah's First Coming by Isaiah the prophet were quite literally fulfilled. Should we anticipate the other prophecies to be non-literal? In other words, every verse of Isaiah should be understood in the context of Isaiah the prophet and be understood from the basic normal rules of language and interpretation. Since the Old Testament preceded the New, we should be interpreting the Old Testament first and see what was intended by the prophets and then look at the New Testament to see what it may add to divine revelation as part of progressive revelation. I am not saying that the Old Testament is to be "unaffected by the teachings of Christ and of the New Testament". What we deny is the New Testament can so radically change what the Old Testament is saying and therefore, the Old Testament essentially becomes meaningless, since what was written was not what was intended.

The third principle Daly claims is "God originally meant or intended by His promises something different to the meaning and intentions stated for those promises in the New Testament." Again, when the reader reads what I actually wrote in my letter to them, that is not the way I stated it and they are simply twisting what I said to make themselves feel better. The promises God made in the Old Testament are intended to be exactly as He stated. The promises God made in the New Testament are also intended exactly as He stated them. What Daly claims is that the New Testament has reinterpreted the Old and therefore, we must ignore what the Old Testament says literally and spiritualize these things to be allegorical or otherwise. The point I was making, as any reader from my letter can obviously see, is that what God promised in the Old Testament will be fulfilled exactly as He promised. Thus if He promises a regathering of the Jewish people into the Land as He does in Isaiah 11-12, then the fulfillment requires a future final restoration of the Jewish people into the Land as a saved people ruled by King Messiah Himself, in the City of Jerusalem. That is exactly what the Old Testament said. That prophecy came well before the New Testament and God expected Israel to understand what Isaiah said before the New Testament came into being. But with progressive revelation God adds more and more detail but the new detail does not cancel out the promises and prophecies He made previously. So again, what additions God

makes with the Church are additions to and not in place of what He promised Israel in the Old Testament.

This basic bottom line is that we should not interpret the Old Testament by the New, but should interpret the New by the Old, since the Old preceded the New. By first knowing what the Old Testament prophecies were, we can then know which ones were fulfilled and which ones were not.

Then comes the following paragraph: "Dr. Fruchtenbaum further suggested that the New Testament does not permit the Old Testament to be interpreted independently or in isolation with the New Testament (i.e. in order to have a meaning other than or in addition to that revealed in the New Testament), then it (namely, the New Testament) is a fraudulent document." Here again, the reader should read what I actually wrote. My point was very simple. The Old Testament was divine revelation that preceded the New Testament. If the New Testament rewrites the Old Testament, cancels out the promises, makes the literal promises of the Old Testament into something that is only allegorical for the Church, in that situation the New Testament would be a fraudulent document. For example, why do we reject the *Book of Mormon?* It is because of what the *Book of Mormon* writes and the way it treats previous Scripture. It rewrites what the Scriptures actually teach, and that renders the *Book of Mormon* a fraudulent document. If the New Testament does the same to the Old, it is also a fraudulent document. I for one do not see the New Testament canceling God's promises to Israel, denying the prophecies will be literally fulfilled, and thus teach that a day is coming when God will restore the Kingdom to Israel, though the timing of it is not for us to know. Therefore, I do not see the New Testament as being a fraudulent document but I see it as being a fulfillment of many Old Testament prophecies. I see it as a fulfillment because I first interpret what the Old Testament says and then I see what the New Testament says and find the fulfillment in it. If the New Testament actually reinterprets the Old Testament and the New Testament actually takes away the promises to Israel, denies the future restoration of Israel, and denies the future and national salvation of Israel, then I would have to say that because of such contradictory statements to what the Old Testament clearly teaches, then it would be a fraudulent document. But I do not find that in the New Testament at all. I find the New Testament affirming what the Old Testament said about Israel, including a national salvation, including a national restoration, and therefore, for that reason I affirm the New Testament is a verbally divinely inspired document and not a fraudulent document. My point was that Daly's interpretation of the New Testament's treatment of Old is fraudulent, since it would make the New Testament fraudulent. But the New Testament does not do what Daly claims it does and hence it is not fraudulent.

The final statement in the introductory segment states "Although other dispensational expositors may have phrased these principles differently, Dr. Fruchtenbaum's rendition is typical enough to deserve a thorough examination." I am hardly the leading spokesman for Dispensationalism and that honor belongs to many others such as Alva J. McClain, Dr. John Whitcomb, Dr. Dwight Pentecost, Dr. John Walvoord, Dr. Charles Ryrie, Dr. Renald Showers, among others. But for some reason they have chosen to attack only me and ignore far more qualified scholars in Classical

Dispensationalism. Perhaps it is because I am the only one who wrote them a letter asking them to represent our viewpoint accurately and apparently *Messianic Good News* was offended by it. Their misrepresentation of Dispensationalism continues in Daly's articles. So let the reader be aware of this basic truth: The Dispensationalism as described in *Messianic Good News* is not a Dispensationalism recognized by those who are dispensational. They obviously do not understand Dispensationalism, but they have chosen not to understand it because there are sufficient writings that explain Dispensationalism both simply and eloquently as well as scholarly.

The first subdivision is entitled "Why is this an Important Matter?" There is a common logical fallacy known as "guilt by association", and the following two paragraphs illustrate Daly's use of such a fallacy:

> "Many Christians have adopted an approach to the Jewish people, to the modern State of Israel and to political Zionism that stems from doctrines derived through the method of interpretation advocated by Dr. Fruchtenbaum. In particular, it is commonly asserted that there are certain "unconditional promises to the Jews in the Old Testament," which "have not yet been fulfilled" and which Christians are obligated to support in the present time to bring to fruition. Dr Fruchtenbaum, for instance, believes that 'the Old Testament promises a national salvation of Israel, it promises a natural restoration when the Jews will live in peace in the whole Promised Land.
>
> As a result of this understanding, a very significant portion of church resources is being spent on Jewish migration and in support of the Jewish State. Christians are moreover being drawn into the political cause of Zionism and have actively promoted war in its interest against Arab and Islamic nations.[1] Furthermore, dispensational views have had a dramatic impact on the gospel that is preached to the Jew, with many evangelicals ceasing altogether to proclaim it, and others trying to convert Jews on the basis of what God is doing right now, and must and will yet do, for the Jews "when Jesus comes again." None of this is compatible with Biblical Christianity – as a true interpretation of the New Testament will clearly show."

One would hope that Daly would have made a distinction between what I actually believe and what others might say, but he apparently does not want to break away from the guilt by association fallacy. Yes, I firmly believe that God has certain unconditional covenants He made with Israel that contain unconditional promises for Israel, and I also believe He has certain unconditional promises for the Church. When he states in the same paragraph where my name appears "…which Christians are obligated to support in the present time to bring to fruition," where in all of my writings have I written such a thing whether it is in letters or in published works? Where in my many tape teachings or disk teachings, or MP3 teachings or DVD teachings have I ever said any such thing?

---

[1] [1] John Hagee's call for military action against Iran (Jerusalem Countdown, 2007) is a well-known example.

What I have stated and written many numerous times is that the promises God makes, He will be the one to bring to fruition without the help of the Church or Christians or anybody else. Yes, I do believe that the Old Testament promises the national restoration of Israel, but I also believe that the New Testament promises a national salvation for Israel in Romans 11:25-27. Yes, I do believe the Old Testament promises a national restoration when the Jews will live in peace in the whole Promised Land, and I believe the New Testament affirms the same thing in Acts 1:6-7. But I have never taught that the Christians are the ones that have to bring this to fruition. Nor does Dispensationalism teach that Christians need to bring this to fruition because Dispensationalists believe in a Pretribulational Rapture, and the final restoration comes only at the end of the seven years of Tribulation following the Second Coming. Israel's national salvation will come just before the Second Coming and Israel's national restoration will come after the Second Coming but both are at the end of or right after the Tribulation. No dispensational scholar has ever taught that Christians have to bring this all into fruition. As for the statement that the "a very significant portion of Church resource is being spent on Jewish migration and support of the Jewish State," the majority of people doing this deny being dispensational so why does Daly insist that they are dispensational? The various groups that organize migration to Israel and things of that nature are not coming from dispensational circles but coming from non-dispensational circles. Though they are premillennial but not all Premillennialists are Dispensationalists. Furthermore, the vast majority are post-tribulational believing they must suffer with Israel and help bring Israel through. They deny being dispensational and in fact they are not. His claim that "Dispensational views have had dramatic impact on the gospel that is preached to the Jew, with many Evangelicals ceasing altogether to proclaim it…" is not describing Dispensationalists but is describing non-Dispensationalists for the most part. While Daly makes a reference to John Hagee, who may claim to be a Dispensationalist, he denies a very essential dispensational point: That anyone who is saved must believe in the gospel of the Messiah and Hagee has become a heretic in that he claims that Jews can be saved apart from believing in Jesus. But this is a violation of the dispensational principle and while Daly seems to want to make a generalized statement that all of those who take that view are dispensational, in reality these very same people deny being dispensational and the reason they deny it is because they are not dispensational. Daly is simply engaging in guilt by association and a straw man argument, which is invalidated by simple truth. I am a Dispensationalist. Therefore, I believe that there will be a future national salvation of Israel and a national restoration of Israel. But I do not believe anybody could be saved apart from believing the gospel message of Messiah's death for our sins, burial, and resurrection. Nor do 99.9% of Dispensationalists believe anything different on this. Here again, it is a shame they have chosen not to bother to learn what Dispensationalism really teaches and they blame Dispensationalists for some of these groups that are doing the deeds he is describing. But groups like the Christian Embassy, Bridges for Peace, Christian Friends for Israel, among others of a similar nature in every case deny being Dispensationalists and they are correct; they are not. So again, Daly is engaging in guilt by association and Dispensationalists are simply not guilty of what he is ascribing to them. But if you can discredit a group by using guilt by association and straw man arguments, why not? It is dishonest, but non-Dispensationalists often use it and Daly is no exception.

The next subdivision is entitled "Does the Bible Permit Various Methods of Interpretation?" Here the article states correctly, "None of this contemplates the possibility of different, but equally valid, interpretations." True enough. But then proceeding toward the next subdivision, "The Dispensational Scheme of Interpretation in the Light of Scripture", they boldly assert that "Dispensationalists are not among those guilty of tolerating diverse modes of interpretations - usually insisting that theirs alone is valid." This is correct. We do not believe in diverse modes of interpretation and we do believe that the basic law of interpretation as found in the Golden Rule of Interpretation cited earlier, is the principle by which all Scripture can be understood. But I might point out that the Daly also holds that his mode of interpretation alone is valid. As I shall point out they follow a rather complicated hermeneutics that somebody had to invent to justify a preconceived theology.

The author then proceeds to quote a statement I made in a letter to him and then tries to draw certain principles from what I said rather than simply sticking to what I said. What I wrote is the following:

> Every Old Testament passage must be interpreted as to actually what it means contextually and exegetically in its own context. Once that is established then proceed and interpret subsequent revelation about what God gave previously. Whatever additional information subsequent revelation gives, it cannot so totally change what the original revelation says.

Is what I just wrote all that complicated? When Moses wrote his five books, did not the people of that day have to interpret what he said in its own context? When Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and any of the twelve Minor Prophets wrote what they wrote, were not the people of their day obligated to understand what these prophets had to say? Based upon what they had available, while certain things may not have been understood, could they not have understood pretty much what the whole of the writing of these prophets said? In order to establish truth of what God was revealing through His prophets, could the subsequent prophets totally change what the previous prophets had to say without making a contradiction of the previous prophets? Did Jeremiah simply contradict and change what Isaiah had written a century and a half earlier? Certainly Jeremiah added a lot of new information that Isaiah did not give, but Jeremiah did not change or reinterpret anything Isaiah had written. If Jeremiah did so, he certainly would not have been accepted to be a prophet and easily would have been accused of contradicting previous divine revelation and therefore a false prophet.

But now let us look at how Daly draws principles from what I said and one can see here that the principle Daly draws is not what I stated.

The first principle is "that God always wanted His intentions to be understood in the time of which He spoke, and in that context." Did I actually say "God *always* wanted…"? I certainly made no such statement and furthermore by applying the Golden Rule of Interpretation I could never make such a statement since Daniel tells us at the end

of his book that in the last revelation God gave to Daniel, comprising chapters 10-12, that Daniel did not understand what was being revealed to him. But there we are told that he did not understand. Since the Bible says literally that he did not understand, then we have to affirm that he did not understand. Obviously there are too many gaps in what was given to him to make it a meaningful whole and therefore, he was told to seal up his book. When the Book of Revelation fills in the gaps of information missing in the Book of Daniel, John is told not to seal the book since now both Daniel and Revelation can easily be understood with the golden rule of interpretation. But the fact that Daniel did not understand the last three chapters of his book by itself does not mean that he did not understand anything else in his book. When he interpreted the dream of Nebuchadnezzar in chapter 2, he was awarded by Nebuchadnezzar for the interpretation of the dream he gave, a reward the king would unlikely give to someone that gave an interpretation that could not be understood by King Nebuchadnezzar. The same thing happened again by King Belshazzar in chapter five. No, neither I nor any other Dispensationalist believes that "God *always* wanted his intentions to be understood at the time in which He spoke, and in that context." But much of what He did say He did want to be understood at the time that the revelation was given. In fact, most of what He said, He wanted to be understood at the time the revelation was given. The author of the article indeed should quote correctly what I said and quote it in context, but then he should let the quotation speak for itself and not read something into it that is simply not there. In other words, what he has done is make a clear paragraph say something that has become unclear and rather complicated.

The second principle he derives from the above quotation is "that God does indeed want us to disregard *all subsequent revelation* for purposes of understanding what He meant by an early oracle." Here again, that is not what I said. I certainly did not say that subsequent revelation has to be discarded. What I said was that each revelation needs to be understood, interpreted, in its own context to see what was intended in that context at the time that it was given. Subsequent revelation might provide further information just as the Book of Revelation certainly provides further information to the Book of Daniel. But the Book of Revelation does not change anything that Daniel said, it does not contradict what Daniel said, and does not reinterpret what Daniel said. But one does not go first to the Book of Revelation to interpret Daniel but one must first interpret Daniel as far as Daniel can be interpreted and then from there move on to see what Revelation adds. So as I stated, subsequent revelation cannot totally change what the previous revelation had to say and Revelation does not change even minutely what the previous revelation of Daniel had to say. So neither I nor any Dispensationalist I know wants to "disregard all subsequent revelation for the purposes of understanding what he meant by an early oracle". But what I do believe is the early oracle must be interpreted first in its own context since it was given first to see what was meant in that context and then we can see what subsequent revelation actually adds in light of all of this. Here again the Daly merely draws out a principle that he wishes we would hold to but we do not. For those who want to use a straw man argument, this is what they have to do. Anyone reading anything I wrote, including the letters I sent them can easily see that I do not disregard subsequent revelation. My claim is that subsequent revelation does not re-write previous revelation to make it say the opposite of what it says.

The third supposition he draws is "that we can establish the original, contextual interpretation of every Old Testament passage with certainty. (If we cannot, we clearly cannot say whether subsequent information would 'totally change what the original revelation says')". I certainly did say and do believe that "every Old Testament passage must be interpreted as to what it means contextually and exegetically in its own context," but did I say that we can actually establish in *every* case what the original contextual interpretation is "with certainty?" Neither I nor any Dispensationalist holds to that view and there are some passages that we are not one-hundred percent sure what the original background may have been but obviously we know what the context is since it is right there in the biblical text. But this does not change the fact that we can certainly understand *most* of what the Scriptures say by looking at the original context and applying the Golden Rule of Interpretation. Furthermore, even in the New Testament there are certain passages we cannot be sure what the original meaning or intent was "with certainty". That is why even within all theological schools, even within the same schools, there are differences to what the specific word and what the specific context may have meant. But this does not change the fact that we can understand the vast majority of New Testament writings by what we now have and the same thing applies to the Old Testament.

So the reader should notice how Daly has chosen to either twist what I wrote, read something into what I wrote that is not there, and misrepresent what I wrote which is what often non-Dispensationalists seem to do with dispensational writings. The author is obviously guilty of one of two things. First, he may be guilty of not having bothered to read a single hermeneutical book written by a Dispensationalist, and if that is the case, what he says is a matter of ignorance and I hope this is the valid option. The second option is that he has read a dispensational hermeneutic but has chosen to deliberately misrepresent what Dispensationalists teach which renders him dishonest. One of these two options is what is valid and there is no other.

The next subdivision is titled "Did God always speak in such a way that His intention could be understood in the time and context of the oracle?" As I noted earlier, the whole statement is not relevant to what we believe since we believe no such thing. We certainly agree that in Daniel 8 and Daniel 12, Daniel did not understand much of what was revealed to him. We cannot conclude otherwise in light of the Golden Rule of Interpretation. However, this does not mean Daniel did not understand the revelation given in other parts of the book such as Daniel 2 which is pretty straightforward. What we have here is a standard typical straw man argument. He has chosen to draw a wrong supposition that neither I nor any Dispensationalist believes, nor in the section quoted from my letter do I make such a statement, and now he wants to huff and puff to blow the straw man down. If his presupposition was valid, he would draw a proper conclusion, but the presupposition is not valid and furthermore, it is very, very wrong. But here again, we should note the real issue. The issue is not whether every prophet understood everything revealed to him. The issue is: Can subsequent revelation simply change and contradict what the previous revelation said? For example, Daly states, "before the exile, the Jews were kept from understanding the meaning of Isaiah's prophecies – until the

cities of Judah had been destroyed and the people taken into captivity." It is certainly true that the people were kept from understanding some of Isaiah's prophecies but hardly were they kept from understanding the whole book. After all, Jesus condemned the Jewish people for not understanding from Moses and the Prophets what was happening in their own day, but if God was the one that "kept" them "from understanding the meaning of Isaiah's prophecies", how could the people be condemned for not understanding Isaiah's prophecies? Daly quotes certain segments of Isaiah to show people did not understand and in those parts of Isaiah and in that specific context that is a valid conclusion. However, it is not a valid conclusion for the parts of Isaiah which could easily be understood, and had the people bothered to study it, they would have recognized the messiahship of Jesus but failure to know the Scriptures caused them to not recognize the messiahsip of Jesus.

Then Daly goes on to say, "The New Testament claims to reveal a profound mystery that God had purposely kept hidden from earlier generations." This is indeed true but the author does not seem to know how the term "mystery" is defined by the New Testament itself. In passages such as Ephesians 3:3-5, 9; Colossians 1:25-27, a mystery is a truth totally unrevealed in the Old Testament, revealed for the first time in the New. Therefore, what was knowable in the Old Testament can never qualify as a mystery because a mystery is only knowable from the pages of the New Testament.[2] Furthermore, the total number of mysteries are eight divine mysteries and two Satanic mysteries. These mysteries were not merely "kept hidden" from early generations, it was totally unrevealed to earlier generations. What these mysteries are is additional revelation that God has given to what he gave earlier and yet none of these mysteries in anyway change, deny, or reinterpret what the Old Testament said. Indeed these are things that he had intended "from the beginning of time". But the fact remains that while this was part of God's purpose from the beginning of time, it was not revealed until the Apostles and New Testament prophets. Not being revealed means that it was not known but it was part of God's plan from the beginning. This is a far cry from what Daly wants to conclude when he claims that what the Old Testament actually says in plain Hebrew or Aramaic is not what was intended. Therefore, what Daly is doing is simply trying to use these mysteries to reinterpret what the Old Testament says and ultimately change what the Old Testament says and not to understand what the Old Testament says. In other words, Daly's hermeneutic makes the Old Testament statements irrelevant and meaningless. But dispensational hermeneutics accepts what the Old Testament says in the context of which it is said, and is quite happy to accept additional information that comes in subsequent revelation whether it comes through later prophets or whether it comes through the New Testament. This way we do not have to ignore what the Old Testament says, but we take it as it reads and while we may not understand every specific verse, we can understand pretty much the whole Old Testament with few exceptions just as we now understand the whole New Testament with few exceptions because even there certain things are not clear and certain words are not understood.

Daly goes on to claim "Furthermore, the New Testament claims that its message is contained in the prophetic writings of the Old Testament", citing Romans 1:2 and then

---

[2] See Ariel Ministries' manuscript "The Eight Mysteries of the New Testament."

connecting that with Ephesians 3:5. Actually that is the fallacy of connecting irrelevant contexts. What Romans 1:2 is teaching is that the gospel was "promised beforehand through the prophets and the Holy Scriptures" and certainly the whole gospel message is found in the Old Testament and the gospel message is that the Messiah would die for sins, be buried, and then be resurrected. That was clearly revealed in the Old Testament and without even looking in the New Testament one can draw that conclusion using only the Old Testament text before the New Testament comes into being. Thus even the rabbis had a theology of the Messiah, Son of Joseph who would die and be resurrected based upon these very same passages like Isaiah 53. What Ephesians 3:5 is not dealing with is what was revealed in the Old Testament, but it is dealing with truth that was unrevealed in the Old Testament and even clearly states that it was only "now being revealed" through these New Testament Apostles and New Testament Prophets. This specific mystery being revealed in the context of Ephesians 3:5 is that there is now a third new entity, the *kehillah, ekklesia,* or church which is a union of Jewish or Gentile believers which is the "one new man" of Ephesians 2:15. This is a consistent application of what the Golden Rule of Interpretation teaches and teaches exactly what Paul wrote in these two separate contexts. The point of Romans 1:4 is that the gospel, which Paul himself defines in I Corinthians 15:1-4, was revealed in the Old Testament and so it was in passages like Isaiah 53 among many others. What he teaches in Ephesians 3:3-5 is something that had not been previously revealed in the Old Testament but only has "*now* been revealed to his apostles and prophets," and the word "now" literally makes it New Testament prophets and New Testament Apostles. Furthermore, there is now a third new entity comprised of all Jews who believe and all Gentiles who believe united into one body and this certainly was not revealed anywhere in the Old Testament which is why it is referred to as a *mystery*. As for Romans 16:25 (actually verses 25-26) the mystery he is referring to here is the mystery he expounded upon in Romans 11:25-27. Daly is making the assumption that these prophets have to be Old Testament Prophets but they can just as easily be New Testament Prophets since to them these mysteries are being revealed. As for I Peter 1:12, the actual subject is found in verse 11 concerning "the sufferings of Christ" and the sufferings of Christ indeed had been revealed in the Old Testament with Isaiah 53 being the classic example but hardly the only example.

Then Daly goes on to quote another thing I wrote to them as follows:

> … to interpret the Old Testament by the New means that the Old Testament documents cannot be understood, or the meaning cannot be determined until centuries later when the New Testament came into being and that is just a faulty way to treat the holy Scripture.

To that statement Daly states "but this is precisely what the New Testament claims." But where does the New Testament claim that what the Old Testament actually said was never the intended meaning that God had ordained? In other words, Daly again is taking subsequent revelation of the New Testament, and instead of simply seeing it as further revelation and additional information to what was revealed earlier, he wants to use it to change what the Old Testament actually said. This is not interpreting the Old Testament by the New but is *re*interpreting the Old Testament by the New in such a way that what

the Old Testament says in plain Hebrew and Aramaic becomes meaningless. Trying to use the mysteries of the New Testament as evidence is totally faulty because there is a difference between what God intended and when the time came to be revealed. Thus the eight divine mysteries were something always in the eternal plan of God, but it was not revealed until New Testament times. These eight mysteries do not change what the Old Testament teaches, they do not reinterpret what the Old Testament teaches, but they do add additional information of God's plan and program to what was already revealed earlier.

It should be remembered that from the time the first book of the Old Testament was written until the time of the first New Testament book was written about 1500 years would pass. Did someone reading Genesis have to wait 1500 years before he could understand it? Did someone living in Isaiah's day have to wait several centuries before he could understand what Isaiah wrote? Indeed there are certain parts of Isaiah that are not clearly understood, but most of Isaiah is understandable. The same is true with the New Testament. Peter mentions the writings the Paul are sometimes difficult to understand and indeed to this day there are certain verses that are not quite clear to any New Testament scholar, but that does not change the fact that the vast bulk of the New Testament writings are quite understandable to the fullest extent.

What should be observed thus far from what has been written is simply this: I interpret every book of the Bible literally unless the text says otherwise and I keep every verse within its own context and interpret it accordingly. Some things I certainly do not understand but I do understand pretty much the whole of the book that the writer produced. I simply apply literal interpretation unless the text says otherwise or as mentioned earlier the Gold Rule of Interpretation and the Rule of the Context. It is on this basis that Daly accuses me of being a false teacher, and furthermore, puts me close to the category of a heretic, though so far he has been careful not to specifically apply the term to me. But this is my hermeneutic and it is an easy, simple, applicable hermeneutic whether one is a novice or a Bible scholar.

Since Daly wants to deny that the Old Testament cannot mean what it literally says, that he claims what was said was not the intended meaning and the real intention would not be revealed for centuries. What kind of hermeneutic does this person follow? Now let us look at it.

Daly states that one of his hermeneutical principles is as follows: "In certain cases, the *original, contextual understanding* was not what God really intended." What an incredible statement! In other words, what God may have clearly stated in the previous biblical context, He did not really mean! If we follow this hermeneutical principle, how can we be sure when the Bible really means what it really says? So when God talked about scattering the Jewish people over the world because of disobedience, did He not mean what He said? That is no longer debatable since the Jews today indeed are scattered throughout the world. But then when God also says in the following passage that someday He will also bring the people back into the land from where they were scattered, does He not mean what He says? If the New Testament contradicts that

point (and it does not) then how can you be sure which one was the intended meaning? Did God mean what He said in the first passage or did He mean what He said in the second passage?

How does Daly justify such an atrocious hermeneutical principle? He quotes Ephesians 3:20 which states "may he not do exceedingly more than we can ever ask or imagine". True enough. But how does that verse in any way mean that God did not intend what He said He intended in the previous passages? Does Ephesians 3:20 justify that hermeneutical principle? Does Ephesians 3:20 mean that what He said in all previous prophecies He did not really mean? No, it does not. God can certainly "do more than we can ever ask or imagine" but that does not mean that He can fail to do what He promised. In other words, by doing *more* than He promised means He cannot do *less* than He has promised. He also justifies it by quoting I Corinthians 1:19: "Does it not please Him "to confound the wisdom of the wise and bring to naught the understanding of the prudent"? I realize context does not seem to be very important to Daly but this is dealing with people who do not believe; not people who do believe. Furthermore, does I Corinthians 1:19 actually teach that the promises God made He did not intend? That the plain meaning of the text is not the intended meaning? He also quotes Isaiah 55:9 that states "as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts." Here again, the context is not dealing with disclaiming what had previously been said and taught. Does that Scripture nullify everything else that God has said previously? Does that nullify the promise that the Israel that was scattered will be the Israel that will be brought back into the Land? Does that deny what previous prophecies have clearly taught? No it does not. In other words, none of these verses that he cites proves his statement that "in certain cases, the original, contextual understanding was not what God really intended".

Then Daly goes on to state "Scripture means what God intends by it, not what man understands by it." This is a true statement but not exactly relevant or applicable to the issue. How does one know what God intends unless He keeps each verse in its own context? How does one know what God intends without looking at what He actually said in the verbally inspired Scriptures? We definitely need to know what God intended but we cannot do it apart from reading each verse in its own context. There may indeed be "some cases" where we may not know all of the facts of the original context, but that is in the minority cases and not the majority as any commentary of the Old Testament based upon the Hebrew text will testify. If the intended meaning of a specific Old Testament passage is truly contradicted by the intended meaning of a New Testament passage how does Daly know what was the actually intended meaning? How could he be sure it was not the original Old Testament passage but the later New Testament passage or vice versa? Furthermore, the fact that some misunderstood the original intended meaning (as rabbis have misunderstood Isaiah 53) does not mean the original intended meaning was not clear.

Daly goes on to use two examples to defend his pathetic hermeneutical principle. Making a reference to John 2:20, he states that the Jews under King Herod spent forty-six years rebuilding the Temple in Jerusalem "in preparation for Messiah's coming". It is

true that they had been building the Temple Compound for the last forty-six years remodeling the Second Temple, but there is nothing in either John's passage or the details given by Josephus to imply that this was done "in preparation for Messiah's coming". He goes on to state "this was doubtlessly motivated by their contextual and exegetical views of certain Old Testament prophecies." That really is a fallacy. What motivated the Jews to rebuild the Temple after their return from Babylon was God's command to do so. Both Haggai and Zechariah were raised up by God to energize the Jewish people to finish rebuilding the Temple, but it was begun about fifteen years earlier. Only the foundation had been laid and no more. By the time of Herod the Great that Temple rebuilt under the instructions of Zechariah and Haggai was already about four centuries old. Now did the Jews in the time of Zechariah and Haggai misunderstand that God really intended them to rebuild the Temple as a physical structure? Did the prophets of Haggai and Zechariah so totally misunderstand God's intention that He did not intend it to be a physical building? A simple reading of Haggai and Zechariah shows how untrue that presupposition would be. God did want a physical structure to be built and that is what He required of them. Furthermore, when Herod decided to renovate the Temple Compound, he was not being motivated by his "exegetical use of certain Old Testament prophecies". He had a Roman/Greek mindset and went on a major building program throughout the country constructing structures more in keeping with the Greek-Roman architectural concepts and he rebuilt the Temple on a grander scale but his motivation had nothing to do with his understanding or lack of understanding of Old Testament prophecies. That is the faulty conclusion Daly makes and then he goes on to state, "But God had a different temple in mind: one built of living stones in which He would dwell by His spirit." Now there is no question that God intended to create a third new entity comprised of Jews and Gentiles that would make up the new Temple of God for this age as Ephesians 2:11-3:10 makes clear. But that was only true once Messiah died and became the final sacrifice for sin. But was this God's actual intent back in the days of Haggai and Zechariah and therefore they were wrong to build a physical temple? This is what I meant when I said you must interpret each passage in its own context first and then see what subsequent revelation adds to it. Thus a simple exegesis of Zechariah and Haggai clearly show that God wanted Jews to build a very physical temple which would be the means by which atonement would be made until Messiah's final atonement is made and then the animal sacrifices would no longer be acceptable and God creates a new temple, a spiritual temple made of believers. But this is in addition to what God had taught previously and not a contradiction of it. In other words, the fact that God definitely had a spiritual temple in mind made up of living stones indwelt by the Spirit of God does not at all negate what his intended meaning was previously. God intended for Moses to build a physical tabernacle. God intended for Solomon to build a physical temple. God intended for Zerubbabel to rebuild the Temple after seventy years of captivity and God intended to have a literal temple until Messiah died. The fact that He introduced a spiritual temple by Messiah's death in no way negates His previous intentions. It does not mean that anyone misunderstood what God intended in Haggai and Zechariah or with Moses and Solomon. God really did intend to have those things, but He intended them to be temporary until Messiah died. So these evidences for Daly's hermeneutical principle that "in certain cases the original, contextual understanding was not what God really intended." is simply inaccurate and it is pathetic the way Daly uses that hermeneutical principle.

A second example he provides has to do with Abraham's understanding of God's promises "to your seed I will give this land." Daly goes on to state "but God intended a greater thing than Abraham initially understood." As far as the statement goes it is very true. The difference is that Daly wants to claim that by that statement that the previous understanding is negated. The correct understanding simply means that God had additional blessings for Abraham beyond what He had initially stated. Daly tries to negate what God really intended in the Abrahamic Covenant – that Abraham would have a physical son, and a physical seed, and to this physical seed, a specific territory was to be given as the Promised Land. His evidence is that "Ishmael was conceived as a consequence of Abraham's original, contextual understanding of the promise…" Here again, the issue is not what Abraham may have misunderstood, but what was the plain meaning of the original promise. When God made the promise to Abraham that he would sire a son who would be the seedson, this promise was made originally in Genesis 12 when Abraham only had one wife, Sarah. Had Abraham simply taken God's promise at face value, he would recognize that what the promise intended was that someday he would have a son through his wife Sarah, no matter how long it would take for that promise to be fulfilled. By the time you come to Genesis 16, ten years have passed and there is a lapse of faith in trusting God's promise as stated. Thus Sarah felt that God needed some help to fulfill the promise and provided Abraham with Hagar so Ishmael was born. But Sarah's and perhaps Abraham's misunderstanding of the Genesis 12 promise does not mean that what God said in Genesis 12 was not clear. Who God really intended to be the mother of the seed-son is only made explicit in Genesis 17 and the child is finally produced by Sarah in Genesis 21. But the lapse of faith in Genesis 16 does not mean that "in certain cases, the original contextual understanding was not what God really intended." It is quite obvious what God really intended in Genesis 12 and what God really intended was finally made explicit in Genesis 17 and fulfilled in Genesis 21. But what God really intended was quite literally fulfilled and Abraham did have a physical son through Sarah, to whom the Jewish nation would come into being. But notice it does not negate what God said in Genesis 12 that Abraham would have a son. Genesis 12 was literally fulfilled in Genesis 21. But whatever else God may want to bless Abraham with did not negate what the previous prophecy and promise stated and indeed that was literally fulfilled and not allegorically fulfilled. Abraham correctly understood from Genesis 12 that God would give him a literal physical son. What happened in Genesis 16 was a misapplication of who the mother was supposed to be since that was not stated in Genesis 12. It was finally made explicit in Genesis 17.

In the same paragraph Daly then goes on to say "Consider that the *gospel of the kingdom* similarly renders the rabbinical and dispensational understanding of the Abrahamic promise, utterly banal." Does it really? Just as God gives additional promises to Abraham as the Genesis book continues, the later promises God made to Abraham did not disallow, discontinue, any previous promise, only added to it. What Daly is trying to do is to claim that the New Testament changes what the Old Testament actually said, or reinterprets what the Old Testament actually said, or that the Old Testament prophecies simply cannot be understood in the original context. What Dispensationalists say is that what God actually promised He must fulfill and whatever else He may add to His program through progressive revelation, that will not change

what God had promised previously. If one holds to a hermeneutic that states, "In certain cases, the original, contextual understanding was not what God really intended," you have to apply that to a vast body of Old Testament prophecies and not to just a few minor passages. The claim would simply be that the Old Testament cannot be understood in its original context and you have to wait until the New Testament clarified what God really intended it to mean, which is a fallacious way to handle Scripture. A Dispensationalist simply has no difficulty accepting what God had said previously and has no difficulty recognizing how much of the Old Testament prophecies had been fulfilled by the New Testament and I might point out fulfilled rather literally. What Dispensationalism denies is that those prophecies that have not been fulfilled will therefore not be fulfilled in the manner that they were stated. What was not fulfilled in the program of the First Coming will be fulfilled in the program of the Second Coming. Indeed the New Testament adds new information and as mentioned earlier, the eight divine mysteries, reveal things that were simply not revealed in the Old Testament. The issue was not a lack of understanding what the Old Testament taught, but things not revealed in the Old Testament but certainly part of God's intention to be revealed in the course of progressive revelation. If there is any New Testament passage that simply says that everything God said previously concerning Israel's restoration will not be fulfilled in the manner in which God prophesied, that would indeed make the New Testament a fraudulent document. My point is that the New Testament nowhere does this. It is Daly's preconceived theology forced upon the text that tries to accomplish this, whereas what he should be doing is simply let the text speak for itself and interpret it accordingly.

Daly concludes the paragraph by saying, "Principles of Bible interpretation should not force us back to the original Ishmael notions once God has revealed that He declared something far more profound." No Dispensationalist advocates going back "to the original Ishmael notions." That was not based upon a lack of understanding what a text says, but it was a misapplication of the text and nothing more. Indeed God may have "revealed that He intended something far more profound", but He never reveals that what He declared previously it was not His intention to begin with. God is not schizophrenic. Yes, there was a time He did require literal animal sacrifices and animal blood for the atonement but now He disallows this is a result of subsequent revelation which does not negate the fact of previous revelation that there was a period of time animal blood was required. The misapplication would be that if somebody at the time of Moses or David said that while the Law did require animal blood, since he did not think animal blood was really important he would therefore not offer animal blood. That would be a misunderstanding of what God intended under the Mosaic Law and the person making that claim would not receive any spiritual benefits from the Lord. The simple exegesis of Scripture is that God did require animal blood at one time, and now He disallows animal blood another time. The later revelation does not mean that the original intention of God was misunderstood in the Old Testament. This is additional information and not a negation of previous information. So no, we do not promote going back to the "Ishmael notions" but we promote taking the Bible quite seriously which means we do not ignore what any verse says in its original context but must be interpreted in its own context and see what it meant and then move on from there. But under no circumstances can we ever subscribe to the unbiblical principle that would say that all those prophecies that are

repeated over and over again about a future restoration of Israel when the nation comes to faith was never the intended meaning of such obvious statements. What is "banal" is Daly's presuppostional theology that makes up a pathetic hermeneutic then apply it to the Bible making it say the exact opposite of what it obviously says.

A second exegetical principle Daly promotes is "intentional ambiguity." The basic principle he uses here is go to certain passages and try to show that there were times when God spoke parabolically, and also that God spoke in a way that would hide the truth from unbelievers, all of which is quite accurate. The problem is that he begins to apply it to passages that are not parabolic and most are not parabolic and furthermore, he fails to note that although these things were hidden from unbelieving Israel, they were not hidden from believing Israel and so those who believe would be able to understand what God was teaching whereas the unbeliever would not be able to understand. In other words, the vast majority of the prophecies about the future of Israel were not parabolic and in places where it is parabolic it is symbolic and that point is made clear in the text itself. So proving that God spoke parabolically is not relevant to the issue at hand here. There were times where God indeed spoke in ambiguity if we mean by that parabolically, but that is seldom a means of His communicating in either the Old or New Testament and always appears in the minority of cases. Thus quoting Psalm 18:26 and Hosea 12:10 does not really prove the point he wants to make that the vast amount of prophecies about the future of Israel need not be understood literally because these are not where the parabolic usage is found. He quotes Matthew 13:11, but it should be noted that the mysteries of the kingdom are being hidden from the unbeliever but they are being understood by the believer. Other quotations he gives in this segment include Isaiah 1:3-4; Jeremiah 4:10; Isaiah 59:20; 8:14; etc. But none of these passages negate the literal understanding of all of the prophecies about Israel. The fact that God spoke parabolically in certain segments does not mean he spoke parabolically in all segments. So did the prophets speak parabolically? Yes they did. Did Jesus speak parabolically? Yes He did. Did the prophets always speak parabolically? No they did not. Did Jesus speak only parabolically? No, He did not. That is why Dispensationalists follow the Golden Rule of Interpretation where passages are taken literally unless the context indicates otherwise and parabolic usage indicates otherwise. What is Daly trying to do? What he is trying to do is to claim that all of those magnificent prophecies about Israel's future all fall under the area of "intentional ambiguity" and therefore should not be taken literally but allegorically. Therefore, God has no special ethnic future for the Jewish people. Here again he follows a rather faulty hermeneutic: Since He spoke in parables here, therefore the parables must be used to interpret what He said earlier. That is simply a faulty assumption. God spoke parabolically sometimes and spoke clearly most times. We interpret the unclear by the clear and not vice versa.

In this segment Daly makes a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, which by the way was a literal fulfillment of a prophecy found in passages such as Matthew 24:1-2 and Luke 19:41-44. The Jewish people revolted against Rome and stubbornly held out against Rome until finally the city fell in A.D. 70. But notice what Daly states here, "those who obstinately held out the siege until its bitter end were probably motivated by their idea of what Zechariah 12 meant *contextually and*

exegetically in its own context." Actually, there is no record that this was the motivation for holding out in the revolt. Josephus who gives us the most detailed account of the fall of Jerusalem makes no reference to Zechariah 12 as being the passage they used. Furthermore, Josephus does say certain false prophets arose that gave them false hope, but they were motivated by false prophets but not motivated by Zechariah 12. Daly is certainly desperate not to have to deal with passages like Zechariah 12 contextually and exegetically in its own context. A simple reading of the prophetic discourse of Zechariah 12-14 he points out that someday all the armies of all nations would come against the Jewish people (12:1-9) which will then lead to an outpouring of the Spirit upon the nation bringing them to national repentance and salvation. Although two-thirds of the nation will perish in the judgment, the whole one-third that survives will come to faith (12:10-13:9). That will in turn trigger the Second Coming of the Messiah (14:1-15) and in turn will bring in the Messianic Kingdom (14:16-21). That is the simple literal meaning of the Zechariah passage and anyone reading it can see that the above outline is the essential outline of that passage. Even if it were true that the Jews of A.D. 70 tried to apply it to themselves (and it is not true that they did so), that would simply be a misapplication of the passage but would not mean that what the passage says literally is not true. There is no "intentional ambiguity" anywhere in Zechariah 12-14. Thus when I teach Zechariah 12-14, I teach it as it reads in its own context which is not ambiguous and is not parabolic and it is easy to understand. But Daly needs to make it ambiguous so he does not have to take it literally and can therefore promote his no future for Israel statements. In spite of his later denials he is certainly a firm believer in Replacement Theology. Yes we believe that the prophecies of Zechariah 12-14 would someday be fulfilled exactly as it is written and that is indeed God's intention which was spoken plainly and not ambiguously or parabolic. We do not see anything in the New Testament that would negate the future fulfillment of Zechariah 12-14 and we see much that would support it. There is no question that the New Testament has a lot further revelation about God's program but it does not negate what He had previously revealed about His program. Daly is obviously fearful about having to keep every verse in its own context and to understand its meaning in its own context since he simply does not wish to have a future for Israel. But those of us who take the whole Bible much more seriously, we cannot ignore prophecies like Zechariah 12-14 clearly teach. The reader can judge for himself whether my interpretation of Zechariah 12-14 reads in accordance with what Zechariah wrote in contrast to Daly's attempt to interpret these passages.

Daly now moves on to deal with the second key issue subtitled as follows: "Does God want us to disregard subsequent information for purpose of properly understanding an earlier revelation? " Again let it be noted that the way this is phrased is really beside the point. I never said that God wanted us to disregard subsequent information for purposes of properly understanding an earlier revelation. My point was and is that the early revelation needs to be understood first in its own context and must be exegeted based upon its own context. Then we are to move on and see what subsequent revelation has. Certainly later revelation can help us understand earlier revelation and the Book of Revelation allows us to understand the early revelations of the Book of Daniel as one example. However, nothing in the Book of Revelation radically changes anything the Book of Daniel said. It is one thing to use Revelation to understand Daniel, but it is

wrong to use Revelation to change, reinterpret, and rewrite what the earlier revelation had to say. The first time God gave Abraham the borders of the land, he gave only the northern and southern borders. In subsequent revelation He also gave the eastern and western borders but the subsequent revelation only added to the previous revelation and did not contradict it, change it, rewrite it, or reinterpret it, as Daly seems to want it to do. So again, the issue is not disregarding subsequent information, but it is allowing us to understand progressive revelation and to understand what God said earlier and adding to what God said earlier to what God says later. So again this is another straw man argument and nothing I wrote implies that we should disregard subsequent information for the understanding of earlier revelation. It is easier to blow down a straw man than it is to deal with the actual issue, and the actual issue is something Daly keeps ignoring.

The example that Daly resorts to is quoting Exodus 12:14-15 which deals with the proper time of the month the Passover is to be observed. He then goes on to state "if we apply Dr. Fruchtenbaum's principle and conclude the meaning of this oracle without reference to any subsequent information, then every Israelite who did not keep the Passover from the 14th day *of the first month* was to be excommunicated from his people." Then to tear down this straw man he just erected he quotes Numbers 9:9-11 that states if an Israelite is unclean and cannot observe the Passover at the proper time because of his uncleanness, he would then need to observe it on the 14th day of the second month, one month later. He then draws his conclusion as follows: "Thanks to this *additional information,* an Israelite in the circumstances described could keep the Passover from the 14th day *of the second month,* and not be excommunicated as required in terms of the earlier revelation – even though God's response to Moses may seem to *totally change* or contradict the earlier revelation." The reader should notice the amount of huffing and puffing Daly is resorting to in order to blow down the straw man.

Let me state my position again, so that even Daly can understand it. Applying the principles I mentioned, since the early revelation was given in Exodus he would first have to interpret the Exodus passage in its own context to see what it meant in that context. When the commandment was given to observe the first Passover, certain rules were applicable only for that first Passover (such as putting the blood on the doorposts) and certain rules were to be followed in subsequent Passovers, which includes partaking of the Passover in a ritually clean state. One of the ways one could be unclean and would be unclean for seven days is touching a dead body. By the time of the second Passover the question was how to deal with the issue of what would be the proper time to observe the Passover, and what should one do if he was ritually unclean and could not partake of the Passover at the proper time based upon God's law in the Book of Exodus. The subsequent Numbers passage is to be interpreted in its own context and see what further light it would shed. But notice, the Numbers passage does not "*totally change* or contradict the earlier revelation". The earlier revelation forbade Jews to partake of the Passover in an unclean state. So the issue now was should he not partake of the Passover at all or should he partake of the Passover at a later time and God's decree was to partake of the Passover at a later time which was specifically specified to a specific day of a specific month. In other words, the Numbers passage does not contradict the Exodus passage, it does not change the Exodus passage, it does not rewrite the Exodus passage,

and it does not reinterpret the Exodus passage. It is still obligatory for Israel to partake of the Passover on the 14th day of the first month, but it will also have to be observed in a ritually clean state. If one was ritually unclean, on that day he was forbidden to partake of the Passover at the proper time but he was now obligated to partake of the Passover one month later. This is a far cry from the way Daly wants to deal with God's promises to Israel where he claims the New Testament totally rewrites, totally changes, and perhaps totally contradicts what the original passage said. The promises of Israel's restoration are quite clear and nothing in the New Testament contradicts what the Old Testament taught. The kind of hermeneutic that Daly wants to apply would render much of the Old Testament prophecies totally meaningless. Resorting to the Exodus and Numbers passages does not prove his case one iota. Daly quotes Deuteronomy 28:58 about nothing being added or subtracted to the Law and then he quotes Deuteronomy 18:18-19 that when the prophet like unto Moses comes then He is the one that needs to be obeyed. That of course marks a dispensational change, which Daly seems to not recognize because his understanding of Dispensationalism is so faulty.

His last two paragraphs are also straw man arguments and they read as follows: "God did not intend that Israel should ignore the *subsequent revelation* of Christ in order that it might comply with the Law of Moses as it was originally given on Mount Sinai. On the contrary, everyone who did not listen to the prophet like Moses would be totally cutoff from among his people." The different dispensations are actually different rules of life and between Moses and Jesus you have a dispensational change occurring. One recognizes when a new dispensation comes into being when three things happen: certain law are repeated; certain laws are discontinued; and new rules are given not seen before. The point is the Mosaic Law had to be kept exactly as it was written in its 613 commandments as long as the Mosaic Law was in force. With the coming of the Messiah, we are now under a new law, the Law of the Messiah (Galatians 6:2) and in the Law of the Messiah, some rules were continued (nine of the ten commandments are repeated), some laws are discontinued (such as the Sabbath law, the dietary code, the sacrificial system), and some laws are brand new and never given before such as rules applicable to the local church. But where in any of my writings, in my letters to them, and in any of my tapes, books, manuscripts, MP3s, DVDs, did I ever say "Israel should ignore the subsequent revelation of Christ…"? On the contrary a simple reading of chapter ten of *Israelology* shows the exact opposite of what Daly claims I teach. If he never read what I wrote then he could be excused for ignorance; if he did read what I wrote then he is being blatantly dishonest.

The final paragraph reads, "Once again, the subsequent revelation has an important effect on what was originally given and intended. We are seemingly ill advised to settle our understanding of an oracle without reference to a later revelation." I never said that we should "settle our understanding of an oracle without reference to a later revelation.", what I did say is that the earlier revelation should be interpreted first according to its own context since it was given earlier and God expected his audience to know what He was talking about at the time that He gave the earlier revelation. Again, later revelation could provide further clarification of earlier revelation as Numbers does with Exodus, but Numbers does not cancel out what Exodus said, and any new revelation

cannot simply undo what the previous revelation said as Daly wants it to be. Again, what you have here is a straw man argument being used to negate Old Testament prophecies, not to explain them.

Daly then moves on to his third point: "Can we establish with certainty the original, contextual interpretation of every Old Testament passage?" Here again this is really irrelevant since I made no such claim that we can clearly establish "with certainty" what is the original context and meaning of "every Old Testament passage". The fact is we cannot even do that with the New Testament. We can understand most of the Old Testament and we can understand most of the New Testament by a consistent application of the Golden Rule of Interpretation. He goes on to state, "the idea that there is a fixed and definite meaning for every Old Testament scripture is Talmudic, not Biblical." Is Daly really serious here? Is he saying that every passage in the Old Testament does not have a specific meaning? It is certainly true that we do not understand the specific meaning of every verse in the Old or New Testament. But is this not the same as saying it does not have a fixed meaning that God intended? The fact that God intended for a specific meaning of everything He said is indeed biblical and hardly Talmudic as anybody that understands Talmudic literature can see that the rabbis do not always stick to the words of Scripture (I seriously question whether Daly has done much Talmudic studies or reading; he seems to be merely repeating what he heard others saying). His subsequent paragraphs go on to talk about Talmudic perspectives but that is hardly relevant to the issue. I have read the whole Talmud much of it in the original languages as well as more than one English translation, but I do not use it to interpret Scripture but I only use it to show some background to first century Judaism into which Jesus arrived. But to accuse believers such as Dispensationalists that really take the Bible seriously and believe that every verse had an intended meaning that God intended it to have, is a very biblical concept because when God gave us His word He wanted us to understand it. Daly is trying to discredit believers who want to take the prophecies about Israel quite literally. So the basic fact is that it is a rare Dispensationalist who has done much or any reading in Talmudic literature; in fact the great majority do not even know what it is. They are simply willing to take the Word of God as it reads without presupposing a preconceived theology and therefore, reach the conclusions that they do. Daly states "Also among dispensational expositors there are critical differences in opinion on the meaning certain key Old Testament scriptures." This is correct, because we cannot always know the exact historical context or meaning of every single verse. But Daly should understand that it is also true of the New Testament. But most of the New Testament can be understood and most of the Old Testament can be understood and so in spite of these "differences in opinion" Dispensationalists fall in more agreement with each than they are in disagreement with each other. That cannot be said with other theologies that are non-dispensational and cannot figure out whether they are Premillennial, Postmillennial, or Amillennial, or something else altogether. Even non-Dispensationalists who are pre-millennial cannot agree whether they are pre-tribulational, mid-tribulational, or post-tribulational.

Shortly before concluding the first article the author makes the following statement, "Where should the Christian then look for the definitive rendition of the

contextual historical meaning of an Old Testament script that Dr. Fruchtenbaum requires? If divergent opinions exist, which one should prevail – or are all equally valid, provided they were formulated without reference to the New Testament and are unaffected by the light of Christ?" I suggest Daly read some good Old Testament commentaries even those written by non-Dispensationalists then he would soon see that Old Testament scholars, Dispensationalists and non-Dispensationalists are in substantial agreement as to what the meaning of those passages are. Even those written by Amillennialists agree as to the actual meaning of the passages that they exegete. The disagreement only comes as to whether it should be taken literally or allegorically, but the actual meaning of the text is very seldom in question. Yes, there are places of disagreement only because not every Hebrew word is clear, and not every context is clear but the majority of the words are clear and the majority of the contexts are clear. What Daly keeps missing is the same applies to the New Testament. There is just as much disagreement as to the actual context of certain New Testament passages and their meaning and even disagreement as to the meaning of certain things that Jesus himself said. Some examples include: Calvinism and Arminianism; baptism (infant or believers only; immersion, pouring, or sprinkling); the Lord's Supper (consubstantiation or symbolic only) among others. These are all New Testament issues over which there is much disagreement. But most of the New Testament is quite understandable. But the bottom line remains the same: Can the New Testament be a valid document if it totally ignores, changes, and reinterprets, what the Old Testament plainly says? And what it says is not that much in dispute.

Daly goes on to write two more major segments which he stated would appear in the next two issues of their magazine, but in the end they chose not to publish it in the magazine but to only post it on their webpage and the following will be in response to what appears on their webpage.

Part two of Daly's article, which appears only on their webpage, is entitled "The Claims of the New Testament". He begins with a series of questions but then draws a faulty conclusion: "…What does the New Testament claim to be? Does it claim to be a fuller and more complete revelation of things revealed earlier? Does it present itself as God's decisive revelation to man – in other words, that revelation which is intended to settle once for all everything that God had planned from the outset? Does it proclaim the fulfillment of what God promised earlier? A positive answer to these questions requires that we read the Old Testament in light of the New." But does it really? Yes we understand exactly what the New Testament claims to be and we accept it for what it claims to be but not the way Daly wishes to reinterpret everything. Yes, the New Testament is "a fuller more complete revelation of things revealed earlier?" but it does not undo what was revealed earlier, it does not reinterpret what was revealed earlier, it does not change what was revealed earlier. The New Testament certainly teaches that in light of Christ's final sacrifice, animal blood was no longer required or acceptable. That is what the New Testament says and teaches. But does the New Testament state and reinterpret the Mosaic sacrifices to mean he never intended or required animal blood? Again, there is a right way and a wrong way in using the New Testament to understand the Old. The right way is to first interpret the Old Testament in its own context and recognize that yes God, really did require animal blood sacrifices for a specific period of

time. Furthermore, the Old Testament in Isaiah 53 also prophesied that the Messiah will be the blood sacrifice to make atonement. The New Testament teaches that the death of Jesus fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah 53. It also teaches that only Messiah's blood was acceptable from now on and not animal blood. So we are now given further revelation through progressive revelation as God's plan works out from one dispensation (Law) to a new dispensation (Grace) which in turn is in keeping with the contrast of John 1:17. What Daly fails to do is apply his own principle consistently. I doubt that Daly would claim that in the New Testament God never intended animal blood to be shed for the atonement and that was Israel's misunderstanding when Moses was given the Law (but then again, I am not sure, for the way Daly handles Scripture, he might indeed deny God ever wanted animal sacrifices in spite of the Book of Leviticus). If Daly would simply apply his own system consistently then he would see what Dispensationalists are claiming: That God's promises to Israel would be fulfilled exactly as He prophesied them and whatever additional information we have about them in the New Testament cannot be used to reinterpret what the Old Testament said, it could only be used to see what further information we have of God's plan and program. We do not have to reinterpret the Old Testament by the new. We should interpret the New by the Old Testament and recognize what progressive revelation does is provide further information about God's plan and program as it continues. As to the questions, "Does it proclaim the fulfillment of what God promised earlier?", it never claims to be the fulfillment of everything God promised earlier. So it does fulfill many of the prophecies and promises of the Old Testament, but definitely does not fulfill all of them. To claim they fulfilled all of them requires one to resort to extreme allegorical interpretation which in turn is based upon a preconceived theology and not based upon the natural meaning of what the text says.

Daly goes on in his first subdivision, "Firstly, what is the New Testament?" He makes a number of statements that are not actually relevant to the issue we are discussing. However, he does sometimes overstate what the issue really is. For example, he claims that the New Testament teaches that Jesus is "the fulfillment of all God's promises" quoting II Corinthians 1:20. Does II Corinthians 1:20 really make that statement? Here is how it reads: "for how many soever be the promises of God, in Him is the yea: wherefore also through him is the Amen, unto the glory of God through us." The passage does not state that all the promises of God were fulfilled in the First Coming and there is nothing yet to be fulfilled. That God will indeed fulfill every promise He makes is certain but not every promise of God was fulfilled at the First Coming. There is the promise of a Second Coming but that is a promise that has not yet been fulfilled. Furthermore, the prophecies in connection with the Second Coming, which includes Israel's national salvation and Israel's national restoration, have not been fulfilled. He backs up II Corinthians 1:20 with Ephesians 3:11 but Ephesians 3:11 reads: "according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." And though Daly claims that the verse teaches that "God's *eternal purpose* has been accomplished" that is not what the verse says. Certainly in Jesus all of God's eternal purposes will be fulfilled but that verse does not say it has already been fulfilled. Here again, Daly reads more into the verse than is actually there. He needs to do so to rob Israel of the promises God made to Israel but those of us who really take every word of Scripture seriously that simply will

not do. Other things he says in this segment are not relevant to anything in our discussion. He goes on to quote the Talmud claiming "the Talmud makes a similar claim: 'All the prophets prophesied not but of the days of the Messiah'". Yes the Talmud says that and apparently that particular verse of the Talmud is Daly's authoritative source. I wish Daly would sit down and read the Talmud for all that it says. The Talmud certainly held to the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom, it held to a resurrection of Israel, and it held to a restoration of Israel, but you would not know this from the way Daly decides to quote the Talmud. For me, the Talmud might be used to be supportive but it is not my authority and my authority comes only from what the Scripture actually says and I take the whole Bible quite seriously and the correlation between the Old and New Testament.

Daly then goes on to make four declarative statements, which contain a mixture of truth and error, and contains mostly irrelevant issues and a few relevant ones.

His first declarative statement is: "the light of Christ outshines the prophets of the Old Testament." A true enough statement except for the way Daly wants to misuse it. He goes back to the statement that God would speak to the other prophets in riddles and through dreams and visions which he then interprets to mean "not *plainly* or *literally*" and contrasts it with the fact that "…spoke to Moses face to face (Numbers 12:6-8)". First of all, if Moses is the one that gave the clear statements of Scripture since God spoke to him face to face and not in riddles, dreams, and visions, then it should be noted that Moses himself spoke of a future worldwide dispersion of the Jewish people (which has been clearly and literally fulfilled) and furthermore he spoke of a worldwide regathering of the Jewish people (Leviticus 26; Deuteronomy 28-30) which Daly insists is never going to be fulfilled literally. But why not? Since God spoke to Moses face to face and not in riddles, why would He fulfill the dispersion prophecy literally and not fulfill the regathering prophecies literally as He prophesied through Moses in Leviticus 26:40-42. Leviticus 26:1-39 was quite literally fulfilled, so why would not verses 40-42 also be literally fulfilled? Daly claims it is because the New Testament says it will not be but where does the New Testament make any such statement? So again, Daly is not merely interpreting the Old by the New, he is actually reinterpreting the Old by the New and interpreting it in such a way that the Old loses any sense of meaning.

As for the prophets, yes God spoke to them in riddles, but that was not the only way He spoke to them. Yes God spoke to them in dreams and visions, but since when are dreams and visions not to be taken literally? Most of what the prophets say are quite plain, not parabolic, not filled with riddles, not filled with signs, but plain statements of Scripture no different than the way Moses spoke. While the means of revelation came to the prophets differently than it came to Moses, it does not mean that what the prophets spoke was never clear.

Another statement Daly makes is "Jesus reveals the reality alluded to by Old Testament *types and shadows*. What was previously understood only by analogy and illusion becomes abundantly clear in Him." True as far as it goes, but in the context of where New Testament writers talk about "types and shadows" it is dealing with the

issues of the Tabernacle, the priesthood, the sacrifices, etc. But most of what the prophets had to say does not fall into "types and shadows" since they spoke rather plainly. But even the items which become typologies were actually quite literal. The Tabernacle was literally constructed by Moses, which in turn becomes a type of the Messiah. The blood sacrifices were literal blood sacrifices but they were also types and shadows of the Messiah. Even the literal events of Kadesh Barnea in Numbers 13-14 become types of what the writer of Hebrews faces in Hebrews 3-4. But the New Testament authors never deny the literal Tabernacle, the literal blood sacrifice, a literal Levitical Priesthood, a literal Melchizedekian Priesthood, but these all become typologies of something future. In other words, the background to the types is quite literal and then we take them to teach spiritual truths. That includes historical events such as the sin of Kadesh Barnea in Numbers 13-14. That is a far cry from the way Daly wants to apply the teaching. What Daly wants to say is that what the Old Testament clearly taught about Israel's future and things of that nature were not to be taken literally to begin with. But these fall into categories of "types and shadows" but the fact is they do not. None of the verses Daly uses even remotely teach that.

The second declarative statement he makes is "the gospel of the kingdom supersedes the Law and the Prophets." This is true but that required a dispensational change, a term that Daly tries hard not to use and yet in essence that is what he says: Whatever was the rule of life up until Christ died no longer applies and that is why we move from one dispensation to another. But the problem is that Daly does not adequately deal with what the Bible teaches about "the Kingdom of Heaven". He fails to distinguish the different things the Bible taught about the Kingdom, and the different facets of God's Kingdom program. He does not want to distinguish it because he wants to ignore all that the Bible teaches about God's Kingdom program and its various facets and therefore rob Israel of any future kingdom as the prophets described in tremendous detail and described it plainly and not parabolically. The way Daly defines the Kingdom of Heaven or the Kingdom of God in this article is not totally wrong and it is mostly true, but it is inadequate to account for all that the Bible teaches about God's Kingdom program. There is a facet of God's Kingdom program not revealed in the Old Testament. That facet of God's Kingdom program is classed as a mystery (Matthew 13) which means it was not revealed in the Old Testament, but revealed for the first time in the New. Yet, the Kingdom program as revealed in Matthew 13 does not undo, change, reinterpret, or deny what God revealed about the Kingdom program in the Old Testament; it only adds a new facet of information resulting from Israel's rejection of the Messiah.[3] The Apostles obviously anticipated the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel in Acts 1:6-7 and Jesus did not deny the future restoration, He simply stated it was not for them to know the timing of that restoration. That is how it reads in plain Greek and it also reads that way plainly in the English translation.

Daly tries to defend that the New Testament fulfilled all of the Old Testament promises and prophecies by citing Acts 13:32. What that verse says is: "And we bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers." It does not say all of the

[3] For more details about the Kingdom program, the reader can find it in Ariel Ministries' manuscript "The Parables of the Kingdom."

promises of the fathers were fulfilled. Furthermore, here again context is everything and Paul goes on to state which prophecies and promises he was referring to. In verse 33 he defines the "promise made unto the fathers" as being "that God had fulfilled the same unto our children, in that he raised up Jesus" and Paul goes on to quote Psalm 2:7 as evidence. Here again, the text says nothing about every promise being fulfilled at the time of the First Coming. He mentions promises but never "all" promise or prophecies. Daly tries to read that into the text but the text says nothing of the kind.

Daly's third declarative statement is "the New Covenant replaces the Old". The New Covenant definitely replaces the Old *Covenant*, meaning the Mosaic Covenant as Jeremiah 31:31-34 predicted and it has now come to pass (Hebrews 8). Here again, this is a dispensational change and we move from one dispensation to another, therefore the Law of Moses is no longer a rule of life but the Law of the Messiah is the rule of life. Daly is a good example to how all true believers are somewhat dispensational but only Dispensationalists are consistent Dispensationalists because they consistently apply the same hermeneutic to the whole Bible which Daly fails to do. But while the New Covenant replaces the Old Covenant it is not the same as saying it replaces the entire Old Testament because there are still much of the Old Testament prophecies that are yet to be fulfilled that are not relevant to the Mosaic Law per se.

The fourth declarative statement Daly makes is "the work of the Holy Spirit". There is nothing here particularly relevant. He states "Man understands God's intentions only as the Holy Spirit revealed them to us". Though I would assume that the way the Holy Spirit reveals it to us is through the Word of God which is authored by the Holy Spirit through His chosen human agents. But having said this it should be noted that many spirit-filled godly men have reached the conclusion that Replacement Theology is simply wrong and that God's promises as He made them will be literally fulfilled. He also states "The out-pouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost would naturally lead to a much greater understanding of earlier prophesies, and of God's eternal purposes, in a way God had not previously permitted to be seen or known…" That Acts 2 introduced a new work of the Holy Spirit is something Dispensationalists have always taught and pointed out and that is when the work of Spirit Baptism began, and that is when all believers began to be indwelt by the Holy Spirit and indwelt forever. But nothing in that passage implies that by the coming of the Holy Spirit believers will finally understand that what God previously said should not be understood as He said but it must be understood in some wild allegorical way. He also quotes John 3:3 when "Jesus taught Nicodemus: Unless a man be born again, he will not ***see*** the Kingdom of God (John 3:3)". True enough but how in the world is this relevant to anything we are dealing with? Dispensationalism does not teach that the Messianic Kingdom will be given to Israel in their unbelief. On the contrary, Israel will finally recognize who the Messiah is, will believe on Him and because of Israel's national salvation, that will trigger the Second Coming and the establishment of the Kingdom, but Israel will be a believing nation at the time the Kingdom is established in its literal earthly form. Again, Zechariah 13:8-9 does teach that in the final judgment before the Second Coming in 14:1-15, Israel will undergo a period of persecution that will see two-thirds of the population die, but one-third will be left and the whole one-third that is left will come to saving faith. That is the plain non-

parabolic meaning of the Zechariah passage. That is what it says. Paul agrees with that in Romans 11:26 when he says "all Israel will be saved". But Daly simply has trouble accepting what the Holy Spirit clearly taught here. He must keep resorting to claiming that everything the Old Testament taught along these lines is allegorical, parabolic, and should not be taken as it reads because it is not clear. But any believer who simply sits down to read it will not find anything that is unclear here.

The second segment of Daly's article concludes with the subdivision "Examples of New Testament Claims on the meaning of the Old." Here again, not everything here is directly relevant so there is a lot of snow here. He quotes Matthew 5:17 which points out that Jesus came to fulfill the Law and the Prophets, but noting implies that everything will be fulfilled by the First Coming. Certainly the Mosaic Law was fulfilled by the First Coming. Certainly all of the First Coming prophecies were fulfilled by the First Coming. What about the Second Coming prophecies like Zechariah 14:1-15? Was that already fulfilled? I do not know if Daly is a Total Preterist in place of being a Partial Preterist, and if he does believe that the Second Coming has already been fulfilled, but if it has, it was certainly not fulfilled in the way the Old Testament and the New Testament portray it.

Daly then goes on to quote John 5:45 where he points out that "The Scribes and Pharisees were condemned for failing to recognize Jesus from the Books of Moses – not for rejecting him as a *subsequent revelation*." Yes indeed, the Scribes and Pharisees failed to recognize the Messiahship of Jesus, because as Jesus says in the same passage, they failed to believe Moses. The Pharisees certainly believed Moses in the way he had been reinterpreted by the Pharisees, but they did not believe Moses as he wrote, because had they believed Moses as he wrote, meaning interpret Moses literally, then they would have clearly recognized who the Messiah is. But they also failed to recognize Him when He came, and the timing of His coming was certainly subsequent to what Moses revealed. They failed to recognize that Jesus was fulfilling Old Testament prophecies because He was not fulfilling them the way Pharisaic tradition expected Him to fulfill it, but He did fulfill them quite literally, whether we are dealing with the virgin birth, the birth in Bethlehem, the kind of death He died, etc.

So again, had they accepted Moses literally, they would have recognized Him to be the Messiah, but because they only accepted the interpretation of the Pharisees about the Law and the Messiah, they failed to recognize Him. What Daly fails to note is that their failure to recognize Jesus was directly due to their failure to look at the Messianic prophecies in their context and interpret what those prophecies actually said in the context in which they were given. Had they done so, they would have recognized Him, but they failed to do so and therefore, they did not recognize Him. In other words, they were using Daly's own hermeneutical principle that while the text says this it does not mean this, but it means that. Because it did not mean what it said is the reason they failed to recognize Him. But a consistent exegesis of literal interpretation would have very clearly helped them to recognize the Messiah and their failure to apply it is where they went wrong.

He goes on to quote Matthew 6:23 but does not explain how that is relevant to anything we are discussing here. But certainly applying his rules of interpretation, will leave most people's understanding of the Bible as a whole in "that darkness".

Daly goes on to quote Galatians 3:8 and interprets it as "Paul equates the *gospel of the kingdom* with the promise to Abraham. When Paul asserts that God *'announced the gospel in advance to Abraham: 'All nations will be blessed through you',* this is not merely adding information that leaves our understanding of the original promise unaffected. It tells us what God had intended by that promise from the outset, namely that *the Scripture foresaw that God would justify the Gentiles by faith* (Galatians 3:8)." What Daly is trying to do with Galatians 3:8 is to claim that the totality of what God promised Abraham was the Messiah and through the New Testament it is realized that what God intended by that promise is that God would justify the Gentiles by faith. However, already in Genesis 12:3 God promised the spiritual blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant would go out to the Gentiles and the principle of faith was already established in Genesis 15:6. Furthermore, the fact that the Messianic promise was part of the Abrahamic Covenant is obvious and I have no doubt that Abraham understood that the Seed of the Woman of Genesis 3:15 would also now become the Seed of Abraham. But the fact that Messiah was to be of the Seed of Abraham through whom the Gentiles would receive their spiritual blessings by faith does not negate all of the other promises God made to Abraham. That is not the totality of the Abrahamic Covenant. Daly wishes to ignore all that God told Abraham and narrow it down only to the one aspect, the Messianic aspect. It is amazing how short-sighted Replacement Theologians can be. A far simpler understanding is simply what was intended to be fulfilled by the First Coming, was fulfilled by the First Coming which included Gentile salvation. It does not rule out all of the physical promises and blessings. Furthermore, what Romans 15:25-27 teaches is that Gentiles "have become partakers" of Jewish "spiritual things". They do not participate in the physical promises like the promise of the Land which still belongs to the Jewish people. Maybe Daly feels comfortable ignoring such a vast amounts of Scriptures and what they say, by simply relegating them to be parabolic or riddles, but as a Messianic Jew or a Hebrew Christian, I simply cannot ignore that amount of revelation.

Daly goes on to quote John 8:56 without showing how this in any way is relevant to our topic. Yes, Abraham definitely rejoiced to see the day of the Messiah. After all, the final promises of the Abrahamic Covenant could not be fulfilled until Messiah came. But again, the fact that Abraham recognized the Messiah was coming does not negate the majority of promises God made to Abraham. It only affirms one small facet of the Abrahamic Covenant, one of about 15 different provisions.

He goes on to quote passages such as Hebrews 11:10, 16, 19, and 40, but nothing in those passages even remotely removes the fact of what the promises intended was different than it was originally given. Yes Abraham looked for the eternal city. But he also looked forward to his seed and receiving the Promised Land since God told him it would not be given in Abraham's day, but it would be given to his seed only as of four centuries later. How do any of those promises in Hebrews 11 actually negate the other

promises God made to Abraham? Daly wants to make it either/or but in reality it is both/ and.

He goes on to state the David Pawson view of Genesis 12:3 is to be fulfilled through Jewish contributions to society. But that is David Pawson's view which is not shared by ninety-nine percent of Dispensationalists as either promises fulfilled through what the Jewish people provide. But typical of his school of theology, he identifies David Pawson as a Dispensationalist, and then seems to apply what David Pawson said with a broad brush. I do not know if David Pawson is a Dispensationalist though I know him to be a Premillennialist. Daly confuses Premillennialism with Dispensationalism and that is not the case. All Dispensationalists are Premillennialists but not all Premillennialists are Dispensationalists (does Daly even know that?) But again that is irrelevant. Let us deal with what the Bible actually says. How does Daly justify ignoring all of those promises of God? By claiming the Old Testament should not be interpreted in its own context but should be interpreted by the New Testament. But Daly does not use the New Testament to interpret the Old Testament but to reinterpret and make it say the exact opposite of what it actually says.

In this manner Daly concludes the second article and I hope that the reader can easily see how much Scripture Daly has to ignore to come to his conclusions. I am glad Daly is not the one who witnessed to me with the gospel, since from his basic hermeneutics I would never know whether the prophecy about the virgin birth in Isaiah 7:14 was intended to be a virgin birth. I would not know if the prophecy of His birth in Bethlehem according to Micah 5:2 was really intended to be the Bethlehem of Judah. I would not know the kind of death described of Him in passages such as Psalm 22 and Isaiah 53 was really going to happen that way. I would not know if His resurrection or death was really going to be a physical resurrection from the dead. I really would not know what any of these passages have to say because I cannot trust that what they say is what they mean. Why is Daly assuming that the Old Testament is not to be taken as it reads, but the New Testament is taken to be as it reads? Why could it not be the reverse? So again, by understanding the Scripture with the use of a consistent hermeneutics by applying the Golden Rule of Interpretation and the Law of the Context is what has helped many Spirit-filled believers to understand the Scriptures quite clearly and plainly.

Now let us go on to the third article entitled "Part 3: Israel and the promises of God." The bottom line turns out to be that what God promised Israel He did not really mean what He said or what He said could not be understood until the New Testament was written. Regardless of what God said, He did not intend to mean what He said and therefore, there is no reason to believe the promises He made to Israel and the way He stated the promise will ever be fulfilled to Israel. In essence, Daly turns the God of Israel into a promise breaking god that simply cannot be trusted. If that were true, what about His promises to us as the Body of the Messiah? How can we trust God do what He said He would do and keep His promises to us? After all, the promises say one thing: That the believer will be with Him forever; but maybe God actually intends something else and we will not live forever? Daly does not see the inconsistency of his position.

He begins by claiming "the additional information provided in the New Testament confirms how the Old Testament promises are fulfilled. Paul told the Jews in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch: 'We tell you the good news: What God promised our fathers He has fulfilled for us, their children, by raising up Jesus' (Acts 13:32-33)". What Daly wants to claim is that this statement shows that Jesus already fulfilled every promise He made to Israel and if He had not fulfilled those promises the way it is plainly stated then therefore, the promises were not intended to be literal but allegorical. Quite a typical approach by Replacement Theologians. But a simple look at the context (another thing Daly enjoys ignoring) is that the word "promise" is singular, and the specific promise he is referring to here is not all the promises He made to Israel, but specifically the promise about resurrecting the Messiah. In fact Paul goes on to quote Psalm 2:7 as well as Psalm 16:10 to show that the specific promise he is referring to here has to do with the resurrection of the Messiah which by then was fulfilled. That hardly justifies claiming that the Acts passage shows that everything was fulfilled at the First Coming. So why do Replacement Theologians keep ignoring so often what the context says?

In the following paragraph Daly states: " [from] Genesis 17:8 we see that the land was promised to Abraham himself as an *eternal possession*. Since Abraham is the principal heir to the land, the promise cannot be fulfilled by bringing his descendents to *live in peace in the whole promised land,* even in perpetuity." His footnote states that the word is singular applying to Abraham individually. It should first of all be noted that the Land was not only promised to Abraham but it was also promised to Abraham's descendents that will come through Isaac and Jacob and therefore, descendants are involved in the promise. Had he bothered to read chapter 10 of *Israelology* (and I did send a copy to their ministry), then he would have easily noted that I would agree that the promise of Genesis 17:8 cannot be fulfilled strictly by bringing Abraham into all of the Promised Land. To fulfill that promise Abraham as well as Isaac and Jacob need to be resurrected and need to be brought back into the Land and therefore, also possess the Land and its entire borders. So what seems to be a good argument against our position is actually supportive of our position if he had bothered to read it. Jesus himself said that in the Messianic Kingdom people will come from all directions to sup with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matthew 8:11-12). Nothing in that passage is parabolic, or symbolic; it is quite literal and plain even here in the New Testament. Therefore, the passage does not negate God's promises to Israel and what the passage plainly reads, it affirms that the very promises God made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will yet be fulfilled to them in the resurrection and the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom. So yes, Mr. Daly, Genesis 17:8 will someday be fulfilled to Abraham personally as well as to Abraham's descendants.

Another objection Daly makes to taking the prophecies literally is in the next paragraph: "Paul explained to the Corinthians that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable* (I Corinthians 15;50). In order for God to fulfill His promises literally, i.e. to give the Land to Abraham, so that he and his seed may inherit it as an eternal possession, we would have to raise them up in immortal flesh." That is exactly right that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will have to be resurrected from the dead in a glorified state. After all Jesus was resurrected, but His

resurrection body still had flesh and bone though the body was no longer mortal but immortal. So believing in a future Messianic Kingdom with a resurrected Israel hardly violates anything taught in I Corinthians 15:50. Furthermore, Daly simply fails to recognize the different facets of God's Kingdom program.

Daly goes on to give several paragraphs which are really irrelevant to the points being made and somewhat nonsensical. Nothing he says in those paragraphs nor any of the verses he cites negates against a literal earthly kingdom over which the Messiah will rule over a regenerate and saved Israel. Another example of a lot of snow that simply melts away in light of the plain meaning of Scripture.

He then comes to another subtitle which he entitles as "Who is Israel?" The opening paragraph reads: "The identity of Israel, namely Abraham's seed and co-heirs, is a further point on which the New Testament cast great light. While Dispensationalists cling tenaciously to the idea of an *unconditional* covenant which must be fulfilled specifically to the *natural* descendants of Abraham, the New Testament is at pains to show – from Old Testament authority – that Israel is a nation founded by election and defined by its faithfulness to Abraham's God." Obviously, Daly denies that the Abrahamic Covenant, once it was signed and sealed, was an unconditional covenant but I suspect he does not understand the difference between conditional and unconditional covenants. The reader can see my detailed defense of the unconditionality of the Abrahamic Covenant in chapter 10 of *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology,* and also in *The Footsteps of the Messiah: A Study of the Sequence of Prophetic Events* as well as in our manuscript entitled "The Eight Covenants of the Bible" and therefore need not be repeated here. But Daly is desperate to prove that Israel is not Israel and wants to apply the term only to those who believe, a standard practice in all forms of Replacement Theology. I see no evidence that Daly has ever bothered to do a word study of "Israel" just from the pages of the New Testament but it is a word that is used exactly 73 times and yet not one of those times is it ever used of the Gentiles or of the Church. It is always used of ethnic Israel, sometimes of all Jews in general, and sometimes of Jewish believers in particular but never of the Church. Even in the Old Testament the term is used of Israel, the elect nation, even when they are worshipping Pagan idols.

Then comes several paragraphs but in none of these paragraphs does he provide any textual exegetical evidence that Israel is not Israel or that the Church is Israel. His claim that "…he is simply affirming that what was already clear from Old Testament History: God would sooner bring forth descendants of Abraham out of stones than fulfill his oath through unfaithful natural Israel." This is a true enough statement as far as it goes, but what Daly ignores is that what the Bible promises is that someday there will be a national salvation of Israel and once Israel undergoes a national salvation there will be a national restoration and that is when the covenants will finally be fulfilled. That is a large segment of what the Bible teaches that Daly simply wishes to ignore or relegate it into what is parabolic, or riddles, or unclear, or some other excuse he wants to give to claim that what it says is not what it means.

A misstatement Daly makes is "God could reduce Israel to a single progenitor and still fulfill His promise to Abraham. This was demonstrated at the time of the Exodus when God twice threatened to destroy the entire nation and create a new Israel out of Moses (Exodus 32:10; Numbers 14:12)." If God was to make a new nation of Moses, would that really fulfill the Abrahamic Covenant? That goes contrary to what Moses himself said in the same Exodus passage. As part of his intercession on behalf of Israel he states in verse 13: "Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, your servants, to whom you swore by your own self, I said unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of Heaven, and all this land I have spoken of I will give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it forever." As a result of that statement verse 14 goes on to say: "and Jehovah repented of the evil of which he said he would do onto his people." In other words, what Moses interceded was that God's promise was not to make a new nation of Moses but to make a new nation through Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and therefore, that is what fulfills the Abrahamic Covenant. A new nation from Moses will not fulfill the promise to Abraham anymore than the promise to Abraham would have meant the same thing as making Israel out of Noah only because Abraham was from Noah and Moses was from Abraham. Yes, Abraham came from Noah but the promise is that a new nation will come from Abraham through Isaac and Jacob. Thus making a new nation from Moses will not actually fulfill the terms of the Abrahamic Covenant. It should also be noticed that in the same Exodus passage Moses goes on to say that he promised to give the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob "all this land" and there is nothing ambiguous about that statement though obviously Daly wants it to become ambiguous. Once again, Daly chooses to ignore the context which is a terrible way to try to interpret correctly what the Bible teaches. Also in the same passage one should notice that although Israel was clearly in unbelief, Israel nevertheless is called "his (God's) people" (verse 12). It would have been good for Daly to have read chapter 10 of *Israelology* where there is a segment that shows how often terms such as "My people"; "his people" and "your people" and similar phrases are used of Israel even when they are in unbelief and worshiping idols.

Another misstatement he makes is "When the prophet like Moses was revealed, all those who did not receive the word that God spoke through his mouth were completely cut off from among their people (Acts 3:22-23), i.e. ceased to be part of Israel. The nation was reduced to a remnant made up of believers in Jesus." Actually, the "cut off" was not being cut off from Israel but being cut off in suffering physical death. That they were not cut off from being Israel is seen in the fact that often the term "Israel" is used of Jews who do not believe and that includes both the Old and New Testaments. It is a biblical fallacy to claim that "the nation was reduced to a remnant made up of believers in Jesus". Certainly the *Israel of God* in Galatians 6:16 is referring to only Jews who believe. But frequently the term *Israel* is used of even unbelieving Israel and so they do not cease to be Israel; they are simply not the spiritual Israel or the Israel of God. Acts 3:22-23 does not teach that Jews who do not believe cease to be part of Israel, but in quoting the passage of Deuteronomy 18:19, he simply points out that those who disobey the prophet like unto Moses "shall be utterly destroyed from among the people". He is dealing here with their physical destruction and not with their separation from being the people of Israel. The antecedent to *His people* in Romans 11:1 is the same people of 10:21; a people in unbelief who are still *His people*.

This is also followed also by several paragraphs that seem to be a lot of snow without anything relevant to the issue. He mentions that Gentiles often became part of Israel but that does not change the issue. He does make a claim that Caleb was among the Gentiles who joined with Israel but actually Caleb was a member of the Tribe of Judah and not a Gentile who became part of Israel. Daly goes on to cite Ezekiel 47:21-23, which is in the context of the Messianic Kingdom, the kind of Kingdom he denies will ever exist, and therefore puts the timing of it to the return from the exile of Babylon. Either way, it does not identify these Gentiles to be part of Israel, but it distinguishes them from the people of Israel and from the twelve tribes but having the right to live within the borders of the Promised Land and be given allotments accordingly. Dispensationalists have no problem with this passage because they take it literally while Daly does not.

Daly goes on to claim that the Olive Tree in Romans 11 is Israel and so Gentile branches are grafted into Israel. Actually Israel is represented by the natural branches just as the Gentiles are represented by the wild olive branches. Furthermore, in Romans 11:24 Paul even specifies that the tree still belongs to the natural branches and it does not belong to the wild olive branches. Obviously, the owner and what is owned are two different things and therefore if the Olive Tree is owned by the natural branches, Israel, then the Olive Tree itself cannot be Israel. The Olive Tree simply represents the spiritual blessings of the Jewish covenants (even some Replacement Theologians recognize this), rooted in the Patriarchs, and the point of verse 17 is that Gentiles are partaking of the spiritual blessings of the Jewish covenants, but again, do not partake of the physical blessings. If I own a car, the car and I are two different things. If I gave Mr. Daly a ride from one city to another he would be partaking of the benefits of my car, but the car still belongs to me. By the same token the tree still belongs to Israel and Gentile branches are only partaking of the spiritual promises and not the physical ones (Romans 15:25-27). He also cites Ephesians 2:12 claiming that this shows that Gentile believers have been grafted into Israel, but that is not quite what Ephesians 2 is teaching. Taking the whole passage in context (again something Daly persistently avoids) Paul points out that originally there were simply two ethnic groups, Jews and Gentiles, and it was with the Jews that God made the covenants and Gentiles were *strangers* to the covenants and *far off,* too far away to enjoy the benefits of the covenants. When Messiah died, the middle wall of partition, the content of which was the law and commandments was broken down. Then Ephesians 2:15 goes on to say "…that he might create in himself of the two one new man…" notice the term "two". What two? The two mentioned in the previous verses as being Jews and Gentiles. Now of those two he creates "one new man" and what should be obvious is that two plus one equals three. In other words, he has now made a third new entity, the one new man, which in the following verse he identifies as "the body" and the body is the Church (Colossians 1:18). So in addition to the two preexisting ones, there is now a third new entity, and that is indeed "new" since it was only born at Pentecost, and this new entity comprises all Jews who believe and all Gentiles who believe united in one body, but this third new entity is distinct from Israel and from the Gentiles. In other words, there is not statement that says Gentiles are grafted into Israel. They are grafted in the place of the covenantal blessings and the fact

that they would partake of the spiritual blessings is already promised to Abraham in Genesis 12:3, but they do not partake in the material blessings (Ephesians 3:5-6; Romans 15:25-27) and of course Daly makes it clear he does not believe in those material blessings.

As Romans 11:26 states "and so all Israel will be saved" Daly identifies it as being "all Israel is equivalent to all who call upon the Lord…" but there is no such equivalence. Within Romans 9-11 the term "Israel" is used approximately ten times. All exegetes agree that outside of 11:26 this always refers to literal ethnic Israel. Therefore, that would be the same meeting of Romans 11:26, literal ethnic Israel. But Daly wants to make it refer to all who believe and not literally to Jews who will come to faith. This is convenient for most Replacement Theologians (some Replacement Theologians agree that verse 26 is referring only to ethnic Israel) but there is no exegetical basis for this and it is a very dishonest way to interpret the verse. For details on the meaning of Romans 11, the reader is again encouraged to read chapter 10 of *Israelology.*

One more thing should be noted in this segment and that is that Daly wants the term "remnant" to apply to all Jewish and Gentile believers. I doubt he has even bothered to make a word study of how the term is used in both Testaments but this is also found in *Israelology* in quite detail. But the fact is the term is a technical term for Jews who believe and does not apply to Gentiles who believe even within the Romans context in Romans 11:1-10. Daly is simply straining at the gnat to find some type of evidence that would make the Church Israel and therefore all of the promises made to Israel are fulfilled in the Church in some allegorical way, but here again, if the Bible disagrees with him he has to relegate it as being allegorical, or riddles, or parabolic because he simply refuses to take it as it reads. Most of us who are not afraid to take the Bible a bit more seriously are not going to be persuaded by such snow. It has been pointed out several times already, not only are Replacement Theologians so good at misrepresenting what Dispensationalism actually teaches and says, they even take a simple letter I wrote them and misconstrue what it says not even bothering to check other sources which I authored which they do have a copy of. I am surprised they can sleep well at night when they go so far to misrepresent where we stand.

We finally come to the subdivision "Conclusion" where some of the above tendencies simply continue.

He summarizes Part I of his diatribe as follows: "In Part One we showed that there is no absolute or incontestable interpretation of Old Testament scriptures based on their original context and understanding. Thus the New Testament explanation of how God fulfilled His promises cannot be said to *totally change what the Old Testament says*." Can any believer who has actually sat down and read through the Old Testament agree with such a ridiculous statement? Is the Old Testament truly impossible to understand as it appears in "their original context and understanding"? Very little of the Old Testament is parabolic, very little of the Old Testament is full of riddles and very little of the Old Testament lacks any plain meaning. Daly's problem is that he hates to understand the Bible as it reads and he wants to do away with Israel's covenantal

promises and Israel's future prophecies and render all of these elements totally meaningless. He wants to claim, in support of his Replacement that what the Old Testament says could not possibly be understood by anybody until the New Testament came along. He fails to see the New Testament is part of progressive revelation and as previous progressive revelation, it adds more information to what had been revealed earlier but it definitely does not totally change, undo, or rewrite everything that God had said previously. But the simple truth is this: The New Testament nowhere reinterprets what the Old Testament prophecy said. It holds to a future restoration of the Kingdom to Israel but refuses to allow us to know the timing of it. It prophesies a day when all Israel will be saved. One has to insist that "Israel" does not really mean "Israel" to claim that what it says it does not mean. The fallacy and the simple foolishness of the kind of hermeneutic Daly uses should be obvious to any serious Bible student. But a Dispensationalist takes the Bible as is and refuses to play games with the text and insists that while certain parts may not be clear the vast majority of the Old Testament is quite clear whether it is historic, poetic, or prophetic. In fact the same principle applies to the New Testament. We do not always have a full understanding of every passage of the New Testament but by and large the New Testament can be clearly understood with the same hermeneutic applied to both Testaments regardless of whether it is an historical or prophetic text. We do not always know any detail concerning certain people mentioned by Paul in several of his letters as he closes those letters, but does not change the fact that what Paul writes can easily be understood for the most part. We may not know who Gaius is to whom the Third Epistle of John was written to but what he wrote in that epistle is pretty clear. We have no information of any detail as to all that Diotrephes (III John 9) did in showing off his preeminence, but although we do not have those kinds of details, we still can understand ninety-nine percent of what the Third Epistle of John is saying. Those principles apply to both Testaments. But as the statement from Daly shows, it is simply impossible for us to understand the Old Testament by reading it all by itself and therefore, we can only understand the Old Testament by what the New Testament says. That means that for all of those centuries when people only had the Old Testament, they could do nothing with it because it was impossible to understand! Again, this is a made up hermeneutic based upon proving a presupposition and it is not a hermeneutic that naturally arises from the biblical text itself.

Then Daly goes on to state: "Instead, the notion of 'an original contextual meaning' that differs from God's *eternal purpose* revealed in Christ, becomes an artifice for those who want to escape the full implications of the New Testament message, especially its implication for Jewish nationalism." Daly makes a contrast claiming that the original contextual meaning of a passage in the Old Testament will differ from God's eternal purpose as revealed in the New Testament but if one simply rereads his articles, he has proven no such point. What God's original contextual was in the original passages He gave is still part of God's eternal purpose though not every detail of His eternal purpose was revealed at any one point of time until the whole Scripture is complete with the Book of Revelation. But the New Testament does not even remotely hint that what God promised in the Old Testament is never going to be fulfilled in the way He prophesied it. The Old Testament states that someday there will be a national salvation of Israel as in Zechariah 13:9. The New Testament confirms this in Romans 11:26. Why

not simply read the text for what it means? Instead Daly has to insist that at least in Romans 11:26 Israel is not literal Israel though yet in nine of ten times when Paul did use the term that is what he meant. So again, he is not dealing with Romans 11:26 exegetically or contextually; he is dealing with it only by forcing a preconceived theology, a Replacement Theology upon the text. He renders the Old Testament totally meaningless with his hermeneutic principle. We Dispensationalists firmly affirm all that the New Testament teaches but we affirm it as it reads and not as Daly wishes to interpret it.

In the following paragraph he again manages to twist what I actually said: "From Dr Fruchtenbaum's perspective, if the New Testament does not conform to his views of *who* the Old Testament promises were made to and of what is required for their fulfillment, then *it* [the New Testament] *becomes a fraudulent document*. But it is rather the sincerity and faithfulness of the believer that is at stake, for Scripture proves our faith and reveals the thoughts and attitudes of our hearts." For Daly's benefit, let me again state what my position is. Since God gave His revelation through progressive revelation over a period of approximately 15-1600 years, He obviously intended His revelation to be understood as it was being given, with only certain exceptional cases, and those exceptional cases are specifically mentioned in two parts (and only two parts) of Daniel's prophecies. Therefore, we should interpret every verse in its own original context to see what was the teaching in its context and that is a very good and sound hermeneutic and a very natural one. People reading Genesis did not have to wait until Exodus to understand Genesis and did not have to wait for Leviticus to understand Exodus and did not have to wait until Numbers to understand Leviticus and did not have to wait for Deuteronomy to understand Numbers and did not have to wait for Joshua to understand Deuteronomy, etc. etc. In other words as God revealed His progressive revelation what He revealed had to be understood in most cases and only on a rare exception was something revealed that a prophet did not understand and often these were in cases of certain visionary prophetic revelations but if that is true only in a very limited sense. So if we have only the Old Testament, how much of it could not be understood? Only small parts could not be understood. By in large the prophecies about the future of Israel are quite clear. The prophecies in Leviticus 26, Deuteronomy 28-30 are all quite clear. People reading prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets can understand pretty much of what it says. So the Old Testament is not so full of riddles that most of it remains a dark secret until the New Testament comes along to reveal what was really meant. In Deuteronomy 13:1-5 God through Moses spelled out how to judge a valid prophet. If a prophet speaks and makes statements that contradict what was revealed in the Law of Moses he is to be treated as false prophet and whenever a prophet speaks he must conform to what was revealed previously in the Mosaic Law. Therefore, these prophets like Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets were all acceptable because even those parts that were not understood did not contradict any previous revelation. Thus when Jeremiah spoke of captivity for 70 years, people understood that the captivity would last 70 years as Daniel did in Daniel 9:1-2. The simple fact is that most prophecies about Israel are stated in very simple language; it is non-symbolic, it is straightforward and easy to understand. So can the New Testament claim to be the Word of God and then teach that all of those statements made in the Old

Testament are not true, because that was not God's original intention? The Book of Mormon is a fraudulent document because it rewrites and undoes what the New Testament teaches. If the New Testament truly rewrites and undoes all that the Old Testament taught and undoes the prophecies of the Old Testament then the New Testament would become a fraudulent document. But does it do that? The answer is that it does not. That is why I accept the New Testament as being a verbally inspired document because it does promise that what has not been fulfilled to Israel in the past would be fulfilled in the future. It does promise a national salvation of Israel and it does promise the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel if you take the text as it reads but that is what Daly has so much difficulty with. There is no argument that the "Scriptures proves our faith and reveals the thoughts and attitudes of hearts." That is a very true statement but what does this have to do with the issue of whether the Old Testament prophecies would be fulfilled in the matter they were given? So again, I have to ask the question: Do all of these statements and verses that Daly has used in any way teach that what God prophesied in the Old Testament would never come to pass in a manner that He actually prophesied? The reader is encouraged to see our manuscript entitled "The Final Restoration of Israel" to look at all the passages that talk about Israel's final restoration and the four facets of it with all the Scriptures behind it and see if any of those Scriptures are anyway not understandable? They state the truth rather plainly. More details are found in *The Footsteps of the Messiah: A Study of the Sequence of Prophetic Events.* And nowhere in the New Testament is any of this negated; it is only Daly's presupposed theology that negates it and it is that simple.

Daly then goes on to summarize what he wrote in the second part of his critique: "In Part Two we showed that the New Testament discloses mysteries contained *in* the prophetic writings of the Old Testament, but purposefully concealed from *former generations*. These mysteries were made known in Christ by *God's eternal command* and revealed to us by the Holy Spirit. What was formerly understood in part was fully revealed in Christ. The Morning Star appears at the first light of dawn, eclipsing the prophets that shone like stars *in a dark place*." Again, Daly has made no real study of the meaning of the term *mystery* the way it is used in the New Testament. What the New Testament teaches and the quotations given earlier in the response is that a mystery is something unrevealed anywhere in the Old Testament but revealed for the first time in the New Testament. Paul's usage of the term in Ephesians 3:3-5 emphasizes this has *now* been revealed to His Apostles and New Testament prophets. In others words, the mystery was not something found in the Old Testament and could not be understood, but it is something that is found not even revealed in the Old Testament but revealed for the first time in the New, so it is additional information to what was already revealed. Again, whatever is in the Old Testament cannot be classed as a mystery; the mystery is only applicable to something unrevealed in the Old Testament but revealed in the New. While it certainly makes clear things that were partially understood in the Old Testament, what was partially understood was not in itself wrong; it was merely incomplete. So again, there is nothing here in the mysteries that in any way undoes the promise of Israel's future salvation and final restoration in all the borders of the Promised Land. It does not do that though Daly is dying to make it look like that. In fact, one of the mysteries happens to be in Romans 11:25-27. It is not the fact of Israel's national salvation that is

the mystery nor is it a fact of Gentile salvation that is the mystery since both were revealed in the Old Testament. The specific mystery is that a hardness has fallen upon Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles would comes in. A look at a lexicon will teach Daly that the term "fullness" refers to a set number and God has a set number of Gentiles He intends to bring into the body and then once the number is reached He will then work with Israel until "all Israel shall be saved." This three verse context alone shows a contrast between Gentiles and Israel and does not make Israel in this verse to mean Gentiles. The fact that a set number of Gentiles must be saved before Israel's national salvation occurs is the mystery unrevealed in the Old Testament. Jesus did not come to finally teach people what the Old Testament prophets were trying to say, He held the Jews accountable for not believing what the Prophets said because had they believed what Moses and the Prophets actually wrote they would have no difficulty recognizing His Messiahship but the lack of accepting the Law and the Prophets as they read, and because they were programmed by Pharisaism kept them from recognizing the Messiahship of Jesus.

Then Daly goes on to state, "Jesus does not follow the Old Testament as *additional information*, but is pre-existent and pre-eminent. He was with God from the beginning and God has ordained the *restoration of all things* to Himself in him." Now how does this paragraph have anything to do with the issue? There is no question that Jesus was preexistent. We are not dealing here with the preexistence of the Messiah, we are dealing with the issue of what God had revealed prior to the New Testament. It is what is revealed in the New Testament that is additional information to what was revealed in the Old Testament. So again, this paragraph is one of those Daly snow jobs again.

Daley then goes on to point out that Israel's "…alienation from the land and its inability to obtain God's blessings because of sin…". This is very true. In fact, the Old Testament tells us as much in very plain speech. But what Daly keeps ignoring is that the same prophecies also spoke of a future turning of Israel to the Lord and would undergo national salvation because they come to faith, and would be brought back to the Land as a believing people. All this Daly simply ignores. It is not that these prophecies are unclear; it is because Daly refuses to accept what those prophecies say and then claims that he is forced to reject them because of what the New Testament teaches, but the New Testament does not teach a rejection of what the Old Testament prophecies had to say.

Daly also goes on to state, "The New Testament describes the church as the *fulfillment* of God's *eternal purpose* which he has accomplished in Christ (Eph 3:10-11)." Certainly the Church is part of God's eternal purpose, but Daly wants to make it the totality of God's eternal purpose and there is more to God's eternal purpose than merely the Church. Included in God's eternal purpose is bringing about Israel's national salvation and restoration just as the Old Testament prophesied and the New Testament affirms, but that is exactly what Daly keeps refusing to accept, because he refuses to accept the text as it reads and wants to relegate the whole Old Testament into a totally non-understandable book.

Then he continues his criticism by saying the following: In order to understand the Old Testament independently of the New, as advocated by Dr Fruchtenbaum, we would have to …" then he points out four specific things. His first accusation is that to accept my view people would have to "contradict what the New Testament says about the way in which the promises were originally intended and understood;". Again, to understand what the original intent was and what the promises were one has to interpret the context in which those promises are made. Then their original intent could be understood. Then moving on to subsequent revelation one can also learn more details of how God will fulfill the promises He made earlier, and furthermore, any additional revelation He chooses to give about the further expansion of His program. This way the New Testament would be affirmed and one can understand both Testaments clearly.

The second accusation is that those who follow the hermeneutic that I use, the Golden Rule of Interpretation and the Law of the Context have to "refuse to accept that the *gospel of the kingdom* succeeds the Law and the Prophets;". I am not quite sure what he means by "succeeds". Certainly, the gospel of the Kingdom does not contradict the Law and the Prophets, but certainly the revelation about the gospel of the Kingdom follows the Law and the Prophets, but does not contradict them. Nothing in the gospel of the Kingdom even hints that the prophecies as they are revealed in the Old Testament will never be revealed in the manner that they are stated. We certainly believe that the Dispensation of Grace follows the Dispensation of the Law and therefore, the Mosaic Law is not our rule of life but the Law of the Messiah is our new rule of life. But this is not the same as saying that what the prophets have to say about future prophecies will never be fulfilled in the manner they prophesied. Nothing in the proclamation about the gospel of the Kingdom even hints that this is something different than the Kingdom as was described in the Old Testament. We certainly believe that the Church is part of the spiritual Kingdom of God, but the Church does not fulfill the physical outworking of God's kingdom program and Daly does not recognize the different facets of God's Kingdom program as clearly revealed in Scripture.

His third accusation is that accepting our hermeneutics people will have to "disregard the teachings of the New Testament on *how* the Old Testament promises *have been* fulfilled;". On the contrary and especially since we are in Jewish ministries, we emphasize quite a bit as to how many of the Old Testament prophecies have been fulfilled in the New. In fact, the evidence for the Messiahship of Jesus requires us to show how the First Coming prophecies were literally fulfilled by the Messiah. As a Jew, I came to believe in the Messiahship of Jesus because he did fulfill the First Coming prophecies quite literally. In our sharing the gospel with Jewish people we show He fulfilled these prophecies quite literally and many have come to faith as a result of this. This is not the same as saying that all the prophecies of the Old Testament have been fulfilled. Daly wants to insist that they have. But the fact is that to claim all of the prophecies have been fulfilled he has to do what he does with the Old Testament: Deny that it means what it says, or deny that it could be understood. Taking the Old Testament at face value, there are still unfulfilled prophecies that must be fulfilled and nothing in the

New Testament teaches that they will not be fulfilled and actually teaches that they have to be fulfilled in the prophetic future for God to affirm and substantiate His own truthfulness.

His fourth accusation is that those who follow a literal hermeneutic have to "ignore the verdict that those who read the Old Testament without the light of Christ are *veiled*." Actually the passage dealing with the veiling has to do with the issue of the Mosaic Law and not with the Old Testament in general. Furthermore, the application in the New Testament is also in reference to those who choose not to believe, but for those who believe it is not veiled. Again, nothing in the New Testament teaches that God will never fulfill the promises He made in the Old Testament. On the contrary, He will fulfill them to the fullest degree.

Daly goes on to fall back on a common Amillennial argument that Jesus told Pilate His Kingdom "is not of this world", which Daly and other Replacement Theologians claim means that His Kingdom would never be *in* the world. But there is a difference between saying "of the world" and "in the world". We are not merely playing semantics here but Jesus Himself made that distinction. Only one chapter earlier in John 17:13 Jesus said that he was *in* the world, but in verse 14 He says He is not *of* the world. To be "of the world" is to be of this world's nature and believers are no longer of this world's nature but as long as we are living we are *in* the world but no longer *of* it. By the same token the Messianic Kingdom of Jesus will not be *of* the world. He is not merely coming back to dispose Caesar and to sit upon Caesar's throne. He is coming with His own throne, the Throne of David and with His own kingdom, the Messianic Kingdom which He will establish on this earth and rule from Jerusalem and restore Israel back into the Land as a believing people. The Messianic Kingdom will be *in* the world but not *of* the world. That is what these prophecies teach but Daly tries very hard to make them say the exact opposite of what they obviously say.

Also in a subsequent paragraph Daly goes on to claim that those who really believe in the future restoration of Israel could be those branches of the Olive Tree that can be cut off. At this point Daly has already crossed the line into the absurdity and stupidity that really requires no comment. Daly clearly holds to Replacement Theology, he is probably an Amillennialist, and to hold that view, he has to treat the Old Testament as a massive amount of material that God gave but what it says becomes totally meaningless because of the way he reads (or misreads) what the New Testament teaches about these things.

In the footnote Daly states "Dispensationalists conclude that it is not the tree, but the cut off branches who are Israel – the heirs of the promise, to whom it must yet be fulfilled in the future. Some Dispensationalists even contend that a cut off branch ceases to be part of Israel once it is grafted back into the tree." I would love to know who these "some Dispensationalists" might be because I have never heard any Dispensationalist teach that when a cut off branch is brought back into the tree he ceases to be part of Israel. At any rate, if such Dispensationalists really exist, they would be a very rare breed since 99.9% if not 100% of all Dispensationalists believe that the natural branches refer to Jews whether they are in the tree or cutoff from the tree. What Dispensationalism teaches is that the natural branches are Israel whether they are cutoff or not cutoff and the wild olive branches are Gentiles whether they are in the tree or outside the tree. But what Romans 11:24 clearly states is that the tree still belongs to the natural branches and the wild olive branches are merely partaking of the spiritual blessings. But the tree does not belong to the wild olive branches it belongs to the natural branches. Furthermore, God is able to graft back in the cutoff branches and he goes on to point out in verses 25-27 that someday this is going to occur and Israel will again be back in the place of spiritual blessings.

This has been a long and tedious response and has taken up quite a bit of my time that could have been spent more usefully elsewhere but in light of questions being raised, I needed to respond. What began simply as a friendly letter asking them to if they wish to criticize Dispensationalism to do so honestly and criticize what Dispensationalism really does teach and not what they wish it would teach and say. Obviously, my plea did not bear any fruit. Instead the result was a three-part public article criticizing what I wrote in a letter and not even bothering to quote specific references to the book I sent them, *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology.* Therefore, I was given no choice but to give a lengthy response to all of their misrepresentations about Dispensationalism in general and what I actually teach and say in particular. In a letter that the Director of the ministry, Peter Cohen, wrote he responds to certain complaints he received from other readers pointing out their misrepresentation of what I wrote. In his letter he states "None the less in the interest of fairness we have decided to publish the full text of the original correspondence on our website together with the complete three-part article. Readers may then assess whether Dr. Fruchtenbaum has been quoted out of context or misrepresented." Actually, in all fairness, they should have published my letter and the original article that was published in the magazine and not merely putting it on the webpage. But honesty and fairness does not seem to be part of their criteria.

It is really a shame that a man with a name like "Cohen" has been so programmed by a theology that was innovated by certain Church Fathers who were clearly, as their own writings show, proven Anti-Semites that he lost sight of what God promised His own Jewish people and follows a theology that originated on the basis of Anti-Semitism.

It is a shame that a “Cohen” could so totally lose the hope of all that God has promised to His own Jewish people.

Now may the reader clearly understand the issues involved and may the Lord protect all from the kind of Replacement Theology being propagated by the *Messianic Good News.*